

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

ONE of the 'Papers for War Time,' issued from the Oxford University Press, has been written by Professor A. G. HOGG. In that paper, under the title of *Christianity and Force*, Mr. Hogg deals with the teaching of our Lord on the right way to treat evil-doers. Many papers have been published on that subject since the war began, but Mr. HOGG is worth reading after them all.

He begins by making it quite clear that he is not going to set Christ's teaching about non-resistance aside as 'an inconvenient mystery.' On the contrary, he holds it to be 'one of the luminous centres of all our thought about the meaning of the Christian Gospel.' And then he relieves alarm by adding that, when it is understood, we shall feel it our duty to support our country whole-heartedly in the present struggle, 'though we shall hate war, and a good many other things, with a more perfect hatred than ever we felt before.'

Why is it that so many Christian people explain away, if they do not openly reject, Christ's teaching on turning the other cheek? Professor Hogg says it is due to two quite healthy instincts. The first instinct calls it sentimental weakness to single out physical violence as a specially hateful thing. The other instinct encourages a man—any man of healthy moral nature—to fight to the death against every form of evil.

But, in response to the first instinct, Christ does not confine His prohibition to the resistance of physical evil. He forbids meeting violence with violence, but He also and equally forbids meeting litigation with litigation, and oppression by government with passive resistance. The words are: 'Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall impress thee to go one mile, go with him twain' (Mt 5³⁹⁻⁴¹). So the real issue is not whether violence should be met by force, but whether force should be used in any manner whatever.

The second instinct—the instinct to fight against evil in any form—Christ not only does not discourage, He encourages it beyond all the teachers that were before Him. The difference is that, while they dealt with the act, He deals with the will. Do *not* resist the evil act, He says. But why? In order that you may effectively resist, and conquer and kill, the evil will.

There is no way of conquering the evil will, and making it a good will; but by not resisting the evil act. Or rather, by meeting the evil act with a good act. For the moment that we speak of not resisting, we remember that Christ's precepts are never negative but always positive. This also was

a difference, and a marvellous great one, between Him and the teachers who went before Him. 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink.' When, therefore, we speak of Christ's doctrine of *non-resistance*, we are keeping out of sight that which seems at first to make the teaching more difficult, but in the end gives it all its ease and victory.

Thus it comes to pass that for Professor HOGG the whole problem is a question of justice. There is a lower justice and there is a higher. The lower justice says, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' And to Professor HOGG it is quite plain that when the higher justice cannot be reached the lower must assert itself. It cannot be reached by any of the nations of Europe at the present time. They are not Christian enough. Even this country is not Christian enough. Therefore if any man should deny the application of the lower justice to this war, he is not ascending to the higher; he is doing great and far-reaching injustice. But let every man who has had a vision of a justice that is higher than 'an eye for an eye,' do what in him lies to enable this whole nation, and all the nations of the earth, to enjoy that vision. Then (and only then) will it come to pass that they shall learn war no more.

The discovery of the Fatherhood of God is the great theological achievement of the nineteenth century. Where was it found? It was found in the teaching of Jesus.

But when we study the teaching of Jesus, when we study it as carefully as the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, Warden of Radley, has studied it, we do not find that the Fatherhood of God has a prominent place in it. We do not find that it has any deliberate place at all. What we find is that Jesus took God's Fatherhood for granted. We do not find that He laid Himself out to teach it.

How could He? Mr. SELWYN, in his book on

The Teaching of Christ (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), shows very clearly that in the lifetime of our Lord on earth the Fatherhood of God was an accepted doctrine in Judaism. No doubt to the Israelites of the Old Testament the Fatherhood was a national rather than an individual fact. But the belief in God as Father of each individual Israelite comes to full expression in the sayings of the Jewish rabbis. 'Be bold as a leopard,' says one rabbi, 'be bold as a leopard, and swift as an eagle, and fleet as a hart, and strong as a lion, to do the will of thy Father which is in heaven.'

Jesus does not teach it as if it were a novelty. It was no novelty. He does not directly teach it at all, but takes it for granted. And yet, it is just in taking it for granted that all the significance of His use of it lies, and all the originality. For He never takes for granted that God is the Father of all men. He takes for granted that God is the Father of those who have accepted Him as Saviour.

There is one exception. It is found in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. But because it is in a parable it is an exception, Mr. SELWYN says, that cannot be pressed. Accordingly, he lays down the rule that the teaching of Jesus on the Fatherhood of God is given to those who have already responded to His preaching.

Even to them He does not teach the Fatherhood of God directly. He assumes that they do not need such teaching. 'The distinctive factor in Christianity,' says Dr. MOFFATT, whom Mr. SELWYN quotes approvingly, 'is not that Christ taught that God was the Father of men, but that God was *His* Father.' And even this He taught rather by example than by precept. He lived within the Fatherhood of God. All His acts were directed by that consciousness. And thus it was, and not by direct instruction, that the disciples learned to think of God as *their* Father.

Now this is rather disconcerting to the soft

theology and the sentimental preaching which have been so popular in our day. Jesus shows that the universal Fatherhood of God is of no value to the man who does not make God *his* Father. And the only way to make God his Father is to take Jesus Christ as his Saviour. It is of less than no value. For it gives the impression that there is something comfortable and safe in the universal Fatherhood when there is not, just as the Jews thought there was something safe in their having Abraham to their father though the axe was already lying at the root of the tree.

There is a fine example in the Fourth Gospel. In the eighth chapter, in His controversy with the leaders of the Jews, Jesus denies their right to speak of God as their Father. For, he says, 'if God were your Father, ye would love me: for I came forth and am come from God.' Mr. SELWYN admits that the passage may be coloured by the Jewish controversy in which the Evangelist was engaged when the Fourth Gospel was written. But the Gospel was written by one who was deeply imbued with the Master's spirit, and was expressing the spirit of the Church. Jesus shows the Jews how useless it is to rest upon the universal Fatherhood. More than that, He denies them the right. And such a passage, says Mr. SELWYN, could never have been written if Jesus had taught that God's Fatherhood was a truth independent of the believer's relation to Himself.

A great scholar and textual critic, Mr. E. S. BUCHANAN, issuing his translation of an Irish manuscript of the Gospels, which often differs in its readings from the text with which we are familiar, is driven to the conclusion that we have no infallible Bible to lean upon. He had already come to the conclusion that we have no infallible Church. What have we then? We have, he says, 'an infallible and perfect Christ, the Saviour and Hope of the World.'

We have 'an infallible and perfect Christ.'

Have we? While Mr. BUCHANAN is writing the words, Professor KIRSOPP LAKE is sending to press his volume of lectures on *The Stewardship of Faith* (Christophers; 5s. net). 'If we go back a little,' says Professor LAKE, 'we find that men believed in an infallible Bible, and that belief has been forced from us by the undeniable proof of fallibility. The same may be said of the belief in an infallible Church. But Liberal Protestantism in the nineteenth century thought that historical criticism would remove all the misrepresentations of later tradition and reveal the figure of the historic Jesus as infallible. Is that hope also to go? Yes, I fear so.'

He does not 'fear' it. His 'Yes, I fear so,' is merely a phrase of conventionality. For on the very next page he tells us that we do not need an infallible Christ. He tells us that we are better without Him. What we need is communion with God.

Now no one will deny that what we need is communion with God. But the question is how we are to obtain it. And when we see the answer which Professor LAKE gives to that question we understand what it means to us when he denies the infallibility of Jesus. He says that we obtain communion with God 'by the striving of the Spirit in personal religion.' It is a well-chosen expression. 'The striving of the Spirit' has a fine Pauline flavour about it. But there is a difference between St. Paul's meaning when he speaks of the striving of the Spirit and Professor LAKE's. There is the difference between Christianity and Judaism. Professor LAKE does not mean the striving of the Spirit at all. He means the striving of our own spirit. The capital letter is a misprint. In the next sentence he calls it plainly 'personal effort.' He says that what we need is 'a living religion of communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort.'

Why does Professor LAKE say that Christ is not

infallible? Simply and solely because He expected that the end of the world was at hand. Let us see then what that means.

No writer on the Gospels can at present disregard the eschatological element in them. If he disregards it, he is set down as almost ten years behind the time. Professor KIRSOOP LAKE is not behind the time. He makes much of the eschatological element in the Gospels. He makes so much of it that it is simply on account of that element in the teaching of Jesus that he says: 'We are driven back to a living religion of communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort.'

In order to tell us what is meant by the eschatology in the Gospels, Professor LAKE carries us all the way back to the Babylonians. He bids us find a Babylonian statesman of the heyday of Babylonian supremacy, and ask him what progress the empire is making, and what policy her statesmen are pursuing. His answer is that the empire is doing well. Uncivilized tribes are being continually brought within it and offered the blessings of civilization, which is good for them and for the world. And the policy that is adopted is to break up a smaller nation and transplant it into other parts of the empire.

Were the Babylonians justified in doing that? They were altogether justified, says Professor LAKE. It is true that the prophets of Israel were of another mind—but we shall look at that in a moment. Professor LAKE says that in transplanting a nation the Babylonians were doing the work of the world. It is the policy of one of the great nations at the present time. 'With one important exception,' the United States of America are doing now just what the Babylonian empire did so long ago—the exception being that the transplantation is not effected against the will of the small nations, but at their own desire.

Now pass to the Roman Empire, and ask a Roman official how the Empire is doing and what policy is being pursued. It is doing well, he answers. The whole inhabited world seems likely to be incorporated in it. But he says that the policy of the Romans is quite different from that of the Babylonians. They do not transplant the conquered nations. They leave them in their own land, offering them the advantages of Roman citizenship, and teaching them to look up to Rome with respect and obedience.

And again Professor LAKE says that the Roman official is right. He is carrying on the work of civilization. It is precisely the policy that is pursued by another of the great nations at the present time. When the British empire annexed the Transvaal, civil rights were at once conferred upon the Boers, and they learned, not without pride, to speak of themselves as a portion of a great empire and to be ready to lay down their lives for it. 'The British empire is the natural inheritor of the Roman experiment, because it is trying to do what the Romans did—to develop an organization in which it is possible for various nations to preserve their identity, and yet to feel that there is a higher unity of Empire above them.'

Now this is all very well for the great empires. But what did the little nations say? How did the Israelites look upon the Babylonian policy of transplantation? Oh, how they hated it! We have no sooner asked the question than there rings in our ears the bitter cry of the captive son of Jacob away there in the low-lying lands of the Euphrates, when his captors asked him for a song and said, Sing us one of the songs of Zion: 'How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.'

The whole world went wrong with the Israelites when they were carried captive. Disaster had succeeded disaster before. But this was the crowning catastrophe. What was the result of their bitter

experience? Out of their experience they developed a new conception of the course of history. They came to look upon it as a succession of dramatic catastrophes. And this series of catastrophes was to end in one great catastrophe. For though they suffered, yet they were never overwhelmed by their sufferings. On the contrary, the hope that never died within them led them to look forward to one grand final cataclysm which was to overtake the world, after which the tyranny of the nations would be trodden under foot. Then the children of Israel, as the chosen of God, would recover their independence. They would live under God's direct governance with His anointed King as His representative on earth.

Of this catastrophic view of the universe Professor LAKE offers an example from the Apocalypse of Baruch :

Before therefore judgement exact its own,
And truth demand that which is due,
Let us prepare our soul,
That we may have hope, and be not put to
shame,
That we may rest with our Fathers, and be
not punished with our foes.
For the youth of the world is past, and the
strength of creation is exhausted,
And the coming of the time is at hand,
And the ship is nigh unto the harbour, and
the pilgrim reaches the city,
And life is close unto its end.
So then prepare your souls, that,
When you rise up, and leave the ship of your
pilgrimage,
You may rest, and pass not into condemnation.

Well, this was the expectation of the pious Israelite when Christ was born. This was the atmosphere that He was born to breathe. Was He content to breathe it? Professor KIRSOFF LAKE says He was content. As soon as He began to preach, He preached the coming of the

Kingdom. And the Kingdom was to come with catastrophe.

It is true that He soon found Himself out of touch with the leaders of religion in Israel. But the cause of discord was not that He differed from them as to the catastrophic nature of the future. He differed only as to the best way of bringing the catastrophe about.

There were two ways. The Scribes said that the best way is to keep the Law. You are hindering the coming of the Kingdom by your transgressions, they said. The Kingdom will come when the whole Law is observed down to the last letter.

Jesus also said, Keep the Law. When they came to Him with the question, What must I do that I may have eternal life? His answer was, Keep the commandments. No doubt He made them feel that the keeping of the commandments was beyond them, and invited them to ask, What then? Still, it was not there that He fell out with the Scribes.

It was in His treatment of those who did not keep the commandments. Instead of saying, as the Scribes said, that there was no hope for the publicans and sinners when the crash came, He set them on a level with, He even set them sometimes above, the Pharisees and Scribes—above the most punctilious of the observers of the Law. No praised and privileged caste could appreciate that. It was inevitable that their relations should become strained. And the disagreement widened when the Scribes discovered that Jesus laid so much stress on the motive and so little on the outward observance.

The other way of bringing about the catastrophe was that of the Zealots. We see very little of the Zealots in the Gospels. But Professor LAKE believes that they are always there. Much of the teaching of Jesus becomes intelligible, he thinks,

only when we place it in contrast to that of the Zealots. For the Zealots taught that the way to bring the present system to an end and inaugurate the new was to do as much mischief as possible to the enemies of God. 'Fight against them,' said the Zealots; 'resist them; rebel; destroy.'

Jesus taught the very opposite. The Kingdom will come, He said, not by fighting, but by suffering. And He offered Himself as an example.

Thus Jesus differed from both parties as to the method by which the end was to be hastened. But as to the form in which it would come He and they, says Professor LAKE, were entirely at one. The Scribes and the Zealots believed that it would be, not slow but sudden. So did He. They believed that the future would show, not a development of forces and tendencies, but a more or less rapid rush towards a great catastrophic upturn. So did He.

And He and they were wrong. That is Professor LAKE's conclusion. He does not think it is a serious thing to be wrong. Strange to say, he thinks it better than to be right. The eschatological hope was an illusion. It was not going to happen. 'But can we,' he asks in his persuasive way, 'can we be quite sure that illusions are not very often the source of progress? Let me take an example. What was the intention of Columbus when he discovered America? It was to find a way to India, and if he had not been under a complete illusion as to the geography of the world he would not have troubled to find what was then a wild and savage country.'

This is true of great men, he says, all through the history of the world. We need not dispute it.

The point is: because Jesus was under an illusion He is not infallible. That is Professor LAKE's own conclusion. And so, simply because, in Professor LAKE's opinion, Jesus expected the end suddenly and soon, He is better out of the way. For it is impossible, he says, 'to find our Saviour in one who conditioned his teaching by Jewish apocalypticism, and believed in what was, after all, an illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God.'

Has Professor KIRSOPP LAKE any conception of what he is trying to do? He shows no single sign of it. He is quite well aware of the difficulty of the study of apocalyptic. He recognizes the variety of opinion among scholars. He knows that it is not possible for any man to be sure that he has come to the right conclusion upon the eschatological teaching of Jesus. And yet he says that the Christ in whom we have believed, we are to believe in no more. He imagines and calmly assures us that we can get along very well without Him.

We turn to the words of another Oxford scholar and we read: 'In a sense which is true of no other personality in history, Jesus Christ still lives and still speaks to the hearts of men. The truth of His message each man may test for himself, not by the process of historical inquiry and criticism alone, but by those deeper and more subtle processes, obedience and faith. There is a charm about His demeanour and a simplicity about His words that will always appeal to the student. But to know Him in all His power and beauty it is necessary to become not merely a student, but a disciple. To the inner Sanctuary of His presence there is only one password—My Lord and my God.'

The Tragic Schism: Can it be Healed?

BY THE REV. J. A. ROBERTSON, M.A., EDINBURGH.

CHRISTIANITY gathers round one central fact of history—the deed of Divine Forgiveness. The meaning of this fact spreads out until it is lost to human view in the far distances of eternity. The recognition of this has often led sincere souls,—it led Coleridge—to say that it must simply be accepted. It is a mystery; but *factum est*, and that ought to content us.

Yet the soul accepting is surely the soul in some measure understanding. There is a difference between the mystery which is an impenetrable horror of great darkness, and the mystery that is a vast luminous orb which you one day find yourself at the centre of—an orb of light shot through and through on every hand with rainbow harmonies. Christianity's central fact is in reality the most familiar and the most moving of human experiences—transfigured in the light of heaven. It is a mystery simply because its meaning cannot be exhausted by human description. It is exhaustless as the mind and heart of God. It is the mind and heart of God.

No man can stand to view the wide horizons of the Divine Heart without being conscious that his feet are on holy ground. Yet God does not bid us veil our eyes. It is no part of a genuine piety to do so. And, though we cannot hope '*in hoc vastum pelagus divinitatis navigare*', we can learn something of the wonder of the ocean where the sun glints on the limpid green depths of the waves by the shore—perhaps even in the whisper of the shell.

I.

The deepest yearning of the human soul arises from the sense of the absence of God. The quest of Religion is to reach communion with God. When we take a bird's-eye view of the long panorama of evolution, we see nature operating through her patient laws to 'break, bloom, and blossom' at last into individuality. The true reading of the world reveals it as wholly given over to individuality. And this last result of the evolutionary process betrays its final source. The effect cannot be greater than its source. Its origin is the heart of an infinite spiritual Life. If the End of Creation is a society of individuals, then—speaking in the language of religion—the ground of

Creation must have been the loneliness of God. This was the Divine Purpose—to produce a race of self-conscious beings—a kingdom of souls who should, by a life of moral effort and aspiration here, become fit for perfect communion with God. The screen of Nature and her slow-moving laws was His method of separating off such centres of personal life from the infinite Life. 'So exquisite is the delicacy of His non-obtrusion, so subtly sensitive is the Glory that conceals itself that He withdraws behind the veil of Nature and the operations of the mind and the ordinary movements of life, to give us the power of standing at a certain distance from Him, that we may contemplate and converse with Him, or, if we will, misdeem and forsake Him for a season.' The gift of spiritual freedom, moral consciousness, is God's way of entrusting to us a share in the fashioning of ourselves—for Him. Here, in man, the Divine Spirit immanent in Creation is reaching back to complete the circle of the creative process in personal fellowship with the personal God.

But if God is a personal and transcendent Being, then the yearning of the heart of man—which is part of the immanent Divine Spirit, groaning in Creation to reach back to the heart of God—is not the only spiritual activity at work to complete the circle of creative purpose. The heart of God is also engaged in a search, by personal ways, to reach us from above—in grace.

Once, in time, the circle was completed, when the Nazareth Boy, in the hour of moral maturity, surrendered Himself in perfect trust to this seeking Grace Divine, without any intervening period of failure, or sense of estrangement, or moral wretchedness; when 'the Son' whispered with unclouded consciousness into the listening silence of Eternity the mystic name, 'My Father.'

If there is any other sinless soul among mankind, let him make the same claim. For the mass of mankind moral consciousness begins with a feeling of disharmony, of inner estrangement, a sense of the absence of God. There may be many degrees of need for forgiveness among men, but the gracious forth-flowing impulse of the Heart of God, seeking from above for men, is received by all but the sinless in an experience of forgiveness.

Where shall we look for the Hand of God thrust through the Unseen in reconciling love, if not in Him in whom the circle of Creation was perfectly completed: in Him of whom alone the Spirit could say, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased'?

II.

It is with this 'tragic schism' we are here concerned—this misunderstanding and estrangement between the soul of man and God; this 'sense of the absence of God' as we have described it, so as to include all phases of the guilt-consciousness. And the problem—for God and for men—is how to turn the estrangement into friendship. What is it that takes place in that profound and moving moral experience, with which, in a broken and imperfect way, human nature is so pathetically familiar?

Must man do anything himself to bring the misunderstanding to an end? Can he make any reparation for the offence that lies at the root of the estrangement? Can the offender be the healer? Would anything that he could do to end the breach satisfy himself in the first place; but, above all, would it satisfy God?

Let us imagine a case of broken confidence between two human friends. You are the offender, let us say, and a very dear and valued friend the offended one. You know you are the offender. You feel you ought to take the initiative. Your conscience is reproaching you. What sort of reconciliation will satisfy that conscience of yours? You set about trying to undo the wrong. Suppose you succeeded perfectly. (Or—no! that is impossible. You may make good material loss or injury. But you can never wholly undo a wrong; indeed, in a sense you can never undo the smallest jot or tittle of a wrong—for the real wrong is a spiritual thing. Between you and the old glad past of perfect confidence a blinding rain, a mist of suspicion and distrust has fallen, and things can never, with that memory behind, be quite the same again). But suppose you had succeeded in paying back in full, so far as outward action can pay back, for all the damage done. And then, in the next place,—for the real injury is the wound to friendship,—suppose you came to your friend, and tried to undo that by confessing in sorrow, bitter and sincere, that you were wrong. Penitence has done its utmost. Is the wound healed, the reconciliation completed? . . . What of your friend?

Suppose your friend had just accepted your action, passively, silently, as a matter of course. Would you be quite content to call that a reconciliation? Would you not rather be inclined to come home and, shutting yourself in your room, say to yourself, in a flood of bitter weeping, 'For all that *I* have done we are as far apart as ever'?

There is a paradox here, but it is a real fact of experience and we must acknowledge it. The paradox is, that though you, the offender, feel that the reparation is yours to make good, yet the making good by outward deed and inward penitence—if that were all—would never satisfy you that a reconciliation had been brought about. It takes two to effect a reconciliation. *The offended one, also, must pass through an experience that is the complement and counterpart of all the bitter sorrow that you, the offender, have undergone in your effort after restoration.*

What, then, is it that must happen in the offended one's heart? Suppose we represent the offended one as breaking through the silence of the first encounter and offering you a bare acknowledgment of your efforts. Would you be satisfied? Your friend has held out his hand to you, but quite coldly, and in a voice of stony indifference said, 'Well, well; let by-gones be by-gones. I forgive you.' Would you be quite happy again? Would you not go home almost more miserable than before? The touch of that cold hand only repelled you, and you shrank within yourself. There was no reconciliation worthy the name.

There is a striking illustration in Mrs. Humphry Ward's *The Marriage of William Ashe*. It is the story of a rising young politician who is almost certain of the Premiership some day. He marries a young, winsome, but wayward wife—dashing, volatile, restless, unconventional, with a strain of French blood in her veins. She does things so shockingly outrageous to the society in which she is obliged to move because of her husband's position, that she well-nigh ruins his career. But again and again there is a reconciliation, and a fresh start made. She was never truly repentant; and at last she commits the grave sin of deserting him for another. Her fit of wayward caprice is soon over, and she repents, at length, in all the terrible bitterness of that word. Alas! that is, when all is said, the best, the only, undoing of a wrong that mortal man can make; and what a tragic penalty a real repentance is! She sends

and tells her husband; there is a sincere and childlike candour about her confession. From the wilderness of this heart in extreme bitterness the great call comes to the man—to forgive. What will the cost of a true forgiveness be for him? Will a mere word do? If he would take his wife to his heart again, he must surrender all—honour, and the fame of public service, the loftiest post in the land, the infinite riches of his life—for love. Society will certainly cast him off, if he stoops to associate himself with her once more. . . . He writes to her. He *says* he forgives her; he will make provision for her. But she is surely too sensible to think he can ever make her again what she once was to him. That is the burden of his letter, and it simply makes the poor broken heart bleed afresh. Womanly intuition—nay, the human heart in her—tells her there is no reconciliation, no real forgiveness there; and she will not come home, though there is nothing but death before her. The rich young ruler of this modern story realized that the call to forgive meant, ‘Sell all that thou hast’—all thy dear-won social and political position. And the cost was too much for him. He went away sorrowful.

It is easy to say, ‘I forgive’—and often very cheap. But if there is to be a genuine reconciliation, it is not merely the sinner, the offender, that has (in Bushnell’s phrase) ‘to make cost.’ Repentance there must be, of course; but the only forgiveness that will satisfy the sinner is the forgiveness that comes through fire and water, out of the very depths of the heart of the wronged one, charged with all the tragedy of the wrong. Only forgiveness laden with the agony of the offence can be experienced by the wrong-doer as real forgiveness—can bring perfect assurance of restoration to the guilty soul.

III.

Is it then humanly possible to heal the misunderstanding between man and God? What is the extent of our offence against God? We have to remember here that the depth of our offence, our guilt, is measured not by what we think of it, but by what God thinks of it. Sin has sometimes been defined as selfishness. The definition is not without its usefulness, but it is only a weighing of sin in a human balance, not in God’s balance. We do not see all our sinfulness by simply taking into account our relations with our fellow-men: we

must try to see ourselves in the light of the purity of the Holy God with whom we have to do. Even of our most secret and private sins the question is, ‘What has God to say?’

The moral and spiritual world has a law of gravitation of its own. Every particle of matter in the universe exerts an influence on every other to the remotest star in the furthest bounds of space. Not a stone falls but *some* change, however infinitesimally small, takes place in the arrangement of the forces of the Universe. It is the same in conduct. ‘The evil that I did,’ says Dr. Horton, ‘passed out into the Universe with an influence the extent of which I can never measure, and the force of which I can never arrest. Just as pulsing out from our Sun goes the light which is reaching the nearest fixed star in the Centaur after three and a half years’ travelling, and then will go on and on reaching different systems years and centuries after, so the sin I committed was as a little ray of lurid light: it passed out into an infinite Universe, travelled, and is travelling, on and on and on. I can never arrest it and I can never undo it. It is done, and it is attached to me, the doer, forever.’

The same writer instances the undertone of melancholy which ran through the preaching of John Donne, the eloquent Elizabethan divine—melancholy which betrayed the conviction that the licentious poems of his early unconverted days would live to corrupt and taint young lives centuries after his eloquent tongue was silent. He had had a glimpse of what his sin meant in the eyes of God.

- Action is transitory—a step, a blow,
- A movement of a muscle this way or that;
- ‘Tis done, and in the after vacancy
- We wonder at ourselves as men betrayed.

Man’s life is woven into the warp and woof of existence. Not a step can he take but it is caught up by this web of life, and ‘is bent into directions and produces events which take place inevitably and without regard to our desires or regrets.’¹ Our smallest act lets loose some moral impulse for good or evil which vibrates to the end of the Universe. Our tiniest act of sin creates a discord which goes shuddering through all the soul of God. For the laws by which the Universe is upheld have their source and life in the character of God. The moral basis and the cosmic conditions of Divine

¹ A. C. Bradley, in *Shakespearean Tragedy*.

forgiveness are one and the same. In the eyes of All-holy Omnipotence individual guilt must be swathed in cosmic gloom.

Taking our stand upon the Pantheism of Paul, let us try to express this in a picture which, however crudely materialistic in itself, may yet be a shadow of the truth. 'God,' says Paul, 'is in all, and through all, and over all'; 'of him, and through him, and to him are all things'; 'of him are all things, and we in him'; 'in him we live, and move, and have our being.' Creation, in Goethe's phrase, is 'the living garment of Deity.' 'God is in the city'—that is a familiar mode of speech with us: it is still truer and more heart-searching to say, 'The city is in God.' We often speak of the Spirit of God moving through the valleys and plains with their burthen of teeming human life: it is still truer to say that the communities of the valleys are like nerve-tracks lying along the breast of God. A sordid sin takes place in some populous valley. The news sweeps from end to end in a little hustling, hurrying breeze of gossip, moving the cynical to laughter, the vulgar to filthy talk, the decent to a shrinking shame, and those whom it most nearly concerns to a bitterness as of death itself. The moral tone of the valley is lowered, its life depressed, by it. Some soul, a life-cell in that nerve-track has gone wrong, and created a discord which jars through the entire length of it: an exquisite agony of quivering pain, which registers itself in the soul of God! The moral filth and slime of cities—fester-spots; the red wound of war across a continent—causing a deep, shuddering horror, or reflected as a great redness of shame, in the holy heart and soul of God! God is a great throbbing, sensitive, tender Heart of Love in which the failure, sin, and shame of man *lives*—beats—burns. The eyes of guilt look up and call it 'Wrath.'

I heard a voice upon the slope
Cry to the summit, 'Is there any hope?'
To which an answer pealed from that high land,
But in a tongue no man could understand.
And on the glimmering limit far withdrawn
God made Himself an awful rose of dawn.

IV.

Does it not seem, then, that this misunderstanding between man and his Maker is too great to be

healed? If in a case of separation between human friends it is impossible for the wrong-doer to pay down in full for all the damage done, and completely undo the wrong, how much less possible is it for the wrong-doer to do anything to restore the broken relation, when the case is between man and God? Our sins are discords which go jangling through all the ordered harmony of the world, and are therefore injuries to God. As Anselm puts it, the smallest sin is an insult to the Supreme Being. It is therefore an infinite insult; therefore something not to be committed to save worlds from perdition. Though we possessed a world—nay, many worlds,—and offered them all to God in atonement for sin, they would be insufficient. Further, just because we have sinned, and thus blunted the conscience, because we are finite and ignorant, we cannot realise the extent and depth of our sin, and therefore cannot feel a penitent sorrow for our offence that could be anything like the measure of the wound it has caused to God's holy love. Only an Infinite Being, One greater than all worlds, can repair an infinite insult. Only the infinitely holy heart of an All-seeing God can feel the full pain and horror of man's sin against Him. We *ought* to make reparation, but only God *can*. That is the tragedy of sin. Is it, then, possible to repair the breach? It is not possible—unless God does it.

Has God done it? Can we be certain that God has reckoned and paid down all the infinite cost which the forgiving heart of the wronged one alone can and must pay, if there is to be a perfect reconciliation? Can we be assured that God's forgiveness has come to us, out of a heart that has laboured with an agony deeper than all the infamy of human sin? To that question we must next address ourselves. The answer can be stated here in a single word—*Christ*. That Life of tragic sorrow was the cost of forgiveness to God. The Cross was God's heart broken at length in His effort to give Himself again to the being who had caused the terrible estrangement. The more we gaze on that Crucified One, the more certain do we grow that it is not in hell that all the agony of all the world is felt. It is in the heart of God. It is only there. And 'there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'

'Breach for Breach,' and 'the Breach of his People.'

BY THE REV. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.LITT., D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IT may be questioned whether either of the two phrases which I have placed at the head of this article conveys to most readers of our English Versions any clear and sharply defined idea; or whether, if such an idea is conveyed to a reader, it corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Nor, English usage being what it is, could anything else be expected. We may speak of a person as suffering from a broken leg, or even as suffering from fracture; we do not speak of any one as suffering from a breach, or even as suffering from a breach in the leg. Yet if 'breach' does not suggest bodily injury, there are certain passages in the English Versions of the Old Testament in which the use of the word must necessarily obscure, if it does not positively misrepresent, the meaning of the original. And, unfortunately, this obscure term receives no explanation in some even of our most recent commentaries. For example, no explanation is offered of 'breach for breach' in Lv 24²⁰, either in the Century Bible or in the Cambridge Bible; or of 'broken with a great breach,' in the Century Bible on Jer 14¹⁷. Under these circumstances there is room for a discussion of some of the passages in which 'breach' occurs in the English Versions, together with some of those in which the Hebrew term so rendered occurs in the original text.

The word 'breach,' or its plural 'breaches,' occurs thirty-five times in the A.V., and thirty-four times in the R.V. In the A.V. it renders—or, in a few cases, forms part of the rendering of—not fewer than seven different Hebrew words; in the R.V. of not fewer than five. It occurs most frequently, and especially where, as e.g. in Am 4³, a breach in a wall is referred to, most appropriately, as a rendering of *p̄er̄s*, or as a part of the rendering of the verb from the same root.¹ The word which is rendered by 'breach' with the next frequency is *bedek* (2 K 12⁵ 6, 7¹⁰ 8, 12²² 5), and again the rendering is open to little objection,

¹ Gn 38²⁹, Jg 21¹⁵, 2 S 5²⁰ 6⁸, 1 K 11²⁷, 1 Ch 13¹¹ 15¹⁸, Neh 4⁷ 6¹, Job 16¹⁴, Ps 106²³, Is 30¹⁸ 58¹², Am 4⁸ 9¹¹—fifteen times in all in A.V. R.V. also so renders in Job 30¹⁴, 1 Ch 14¹¹, but renders otherwise in 2 S 6⁸ (= 1 Ch 13¹¹).

except on the ground perhaps that some other English term than that used for *p̄er̄s* would have been more convenient. The occasional use of 'breach' to render certain other words² need not detain us. What we are concerned with is passages in which 'breach' renders *sheber*. These number six in the A.V. (Lv 24²⁰, Ps 60², Pr 15⁴, Is 30²⁶, Jer 14¹⁷, La 2¹³) and four in the R.V., which has a different rendering in Pr 15⁴ and Is 30²⁶.

Etymologically, nothing is clearer than the Hebrew word *sheber*: it is a noun from the familiar root *shbr*, *to break*. It is this, doubtless, that led the translators of the A.V. to render it by *breach*, and the Revisers to retain this rendering in four passages. Unfortunately, as we have seen, the range of meanings in *sheber* and *breach* is by no means the same; and the English translators, and especially the Revisers, betray their doubts as to the legitimacy of the rendering *breach* by abandoning it in a number of passages very similar to those in which it is retained. Thus A.V. and R.V. alike render *sheber*, not by 'breach,' but by 'hurt' in Jer 8¹¹, 21 10¹⁹; and also in Jer 6¹⁴, where, however, the A.V. gives on the margin as alternatives 'bruise' or 'breach,' and the R.V. margin gives the alternative 'breach.' R.V. substitutes 'hurt' as a rendering of *sheber* for 'breach' (A.V.) in Is 30²⁶, and for 'bruise' (A.V.) in Jer 30¹², Nah 3¹⁹; and for 'affliction' (A.V.) in Jer 30¹⁵. On the other hand, R.V. retains the rendering 'affliction' in Am 6⁶, and follows A.V. in giving 'destruction' as yet another rendering of *sheber* in La 2¹¹ 3⁴⁸ 4¹⁰, in the first of these passages only giving 'hurt' as an alternative in the margin.

This great variety of renderings, even in a group of similar passages, is partly due to a real uncertainty as to the precise force of the word *sheber* in a given passage. Something almost as general as 'destruction' seems to be required by the context in La 4¹⁰, as it certainly is sometimes else-

² These are: (1) מִקְרָב, Is 22⁹; עַמְקָה, Is 7⁶, Ezk 26¹⁰; and in R.V. only עַמְקָה, 2 K 25⁴, Jer 52⁷; עַמְקָה, Jer 39²; (2) רַסְעֵם, Am 6¹¹; (3) מְפֻרְצֵי, Jg 5¹⁷ (A.V. only); and (4) חֲנוֹתָה, Nu 14³⁴ (A.V. only).

where (e.g. Jer 4⁶); but it is doubtful whether the meaning is not more precise even in the very similar sentence in La 3⁴⁸; ¹ and I believe it to be tolerably certain that in the remainder of the passages cited in the last paragraph *sheber* means some form of bodily injury. The figure before the mind as these several passages were written was of an injured human body; the same figure ought to be brought before the mind of the English reader; but general renderings like ‘affliction’ and ‘destruction’ call up no single clear picture; and ‘breach,’ if it clearly suggests a picture at all, probably suggests the wrong one. I proceed to a closer examination of some of the passages in question, in the course of which we may consider whether in any or all cases any particular form of bodily injury is more especially suggested by the word *sheber*. But even if bodily injury in general be denoted, and not any particular form of such injury, the rendering *breach* is inappropriate, and even the rendering *hurt* is too general, for a man may be hurt in other ways than on his body.

I turn first to Lv 24²⁰—the *lex talionis*. This runs in E.V.V. as follows: ‘And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.’ In spite of their terseness, the last two clauses are clear: if a man has caused another the loss of an eye or a tooth, he must himself be deprived of eye or tooth. Of course these are merely illustrative instances of a general principle; but what is the first illustrative instance? The first clause certainly does not mean that if a man has made a breach in his neighbour’s wall, a breach must be made in his wall, as the familiar usage of the term *breach* might suggest to an English reader; it refers to some form of bodily injury, but not to bodily injury in general, for like the two clauses that follow, this first clause must be specific. The clause means: if a man breaks some part of his neighbour’s body, that part of his own body must be broken. Like ourselves, the Hebrews were accustomed to speak of broken hearts and broken bones. We also speak of broken skin; whether the Hebrews did the same is less clear. Unless they did so, the *lex talionis* is specifying in particular broken bones,

for broken hearts can scarcely have entered into the consideration of the framers of the law. The slight freedom of translation—if so it be regarded—may therefore be pardoned in the Polychrome Bible,² which brings out the real meaning clearly by rendering the three clauses, ‘limb for limb, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.’ The first clause in Leviticus thus takes the place of two clauses specifying the limbs in Ex 21²⁴, which runs: ‘eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.’ If a man break another’s hand, foot, leg, or arm, or by implication any other bone, his own must be broken. The illustrative instances specified in the Code of Hammurabi (§§ 196, 197, 200) are thus the same as in Lv 24²⁰, the verb in the clause of the code which refers to the bone being from the same root as the Hebrew term which is rendered ‘breach’ in E.V., ‘limb’ in the Polychrome Bible, and which actually means *what is broken*, this being limited in certain contexts to what is broken in the human body, and particularly the bones. It may be convenient to cite³ the three clauses from the Babylonian Codex, and I will add the original of the ‘bone’ clauses:

‘§ 196. If a man have destroyed (*úh-tap-pi-id*) the eye of a gentleman, they shall destroy his eye.

‘§ 197. If he have broken a gentleman’s bone, they shall break his bone (*šum-mae šmet a-wi-lim iš-te-bi-ir eṣemta-šu i-sě-ib-bi-ru* (= שברו)).

‘§ 200. If a man have knocked out (*it-ta-di*) the tooth of a man of his own rank, they shall knock out his tooth.’

It may also serve further to illuminate the term *sheber* as used in Lv 24²⁰, and to prepare the way for the understanding of other passages in which the word is used and is rendered by ‘breach’ in the E.V.V., if we have before us at this point certain passages in which the verb which is used in § 197 of the Code of Hammurabi, and with which the Hebrew noun *sheber* is cognate, occurs.

I cite first Lv 21¹⁹. This occurs in an enumeration of various bodily defects that render a priest unfit for sacrificial duties: the verse is rendered very idiomatically in R.V.—‘a man that is broken footed or broken handed’; but had the Revisers kept to the rendering of *sheber* which they ad-

¹ If *sheber* is rightly rendered destruction in La 3⁴⁸, we should have an interesting instance of the same phrase (שבר בַּה עַמָּךְ) used with different meanings in Jer. and La.

² *The Book of Leviticus*, by S. R. Driver and H. A. White.

³ From R. W. Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 445).

mitted in some other passages, they would have rendered—‘a man in whom is a breach of the foot, or a breach of the hand.’¹ The term *sheber* is here commonly and rightly understood to refer to broken bones—the bones of the hand and the foot in particular, though perchance it may also have included malformations producing a similar appearance or effect to that which would arise from actual fracture. Among the ‘defects which render an animal unfit for sacrifice is its being ‘broken or maimed’ (Lv 22²²); the second of these terms (*ḥārūṣ*) appears to mean really ‘having had its flesh cut into’; the first (*shābūr*) means *broken (in limb)*.

Ought we, however, to infer from Ex 22¹⁰(9).
14(18) that *sheber*, *shābūr*, *nishbār*, though etymologically meaning *what is broken*, became in usage extended to mean any hurt received by a human or animal body? This appears to be the view underlying the use of the term *hurt* in several passages in the R.V., some of which have already been referred to; and it may receive at first sight some support from the law regarding responsibility for animals entrusted or lent to another by their owner (Ex 22¹⁰(9)), the first part of which in the R.V. reads: ‘If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it die, or be hurt (i.e. *nishbār*), or driven away, no man seeing it,’ etc.; for here the law contemplates two cases of complete loss to the owner of the animal—loss by death and loss by raiders—and one of partial loss, namely, loss through injury. But the crucial question is: does the law regulate by an exhaustive statement of possibilities, or, as in the *lex talionis*, by typical instances? In the first alternative, *be hurt* would be the more satisfactory rendering; in the second, it would be better to keep nearer to the fundamental meaning of *nishbār*, and to render *get (a limb) broken*. In favour of the second alternative it may be noted that the law does not exhaust possibilities; for it does not refer to strayed cattle. Moreover, in v.¹⁴(18) the instances are abbreviated still further to one only of complete loss, and one of partial loss.

With the inconsistency that marks the E.V.V. in their renderings of *sheber*, *nishbār*, etc., the rendering ‘hurt’ is abandoned in a prophetic catalogue of hazards to cattle in favour of ‘broken’; and this latter rendering, if we understand it to mean *broken (in limb)*, no doubt gives us the right turn

of meaning in Ezk 34⁴ (cf. also v.¹⁶): ‘The diseased [sheep] have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost.’ Similarly E.V. has ‘broken,’ not ‘hurt,’ in Zec 11¹⁶.

As a further example of the verb *shebar* in connexion with broken limbs, and of binding up as the most conspicuous element in the treatment of fractures, Ezk 30²¹ may be cited; not, however, from the E.V. with its curious reference to a ‘roller,’ but from Professor Toy’s translation: ‘I break the arm of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and it shall not be bound up, so that healing applications may be made, and bandages put on, to make it strong to grasp the sword.’ Naturally enough the more general term *to heal* (שָׁׁלֵא) could also be used for the treatment of bones that had been broken (Zec 11¹⁶).

I come now to the passages in which the Hebrew text speaks of the *sheber* (*bath*) ‘ammi’ (or *siyyōn*), and the E.V.V. of the ‘breach’ or ‘hurt of (the daughter of) my people (or Sion).’ It is, I hope, obvious by now that *breach* is a wholly unsatisfactory rendering; is ‘hurt’ the best? Do these passages speak of some undefined bodily injury, or specifically of broken limbs or bones? I believe that in most of them at least the more specific reference is intended.

La 2¹³ is not without difficulties. The E.V. reads: ‘What shall I equal to thee, that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Sion? For thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?’ It is possible that R.V. refrained from substituting *hurt* here on the ground that *sheber* refers to breaches in the walls of the city; and it may be for a similar reason that Dr. Smith² renders:

Vast as the sea is thy ruin:
Who will restore thee?

But if the *personal* figure of the Virgin of Sion which was before the mind of the writer in the previous lines was dissolving into a vision of the actual ruins of the *city*, the pronoun at the end would almost certainly have been third person, referring to the breach, or ruin (cf. Ps 60²); *thee* implies that the personal figure is still, or again (but that would be most improbable), before the mind of the writer. It is strange certainly to com-

¹ איש אשר יהיה בו שבר רגל או שבר יד.

² G. H. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 277.

pare for size the fracture of bones and the sea; but it is not altogether certain that this comparison stood in the original text; if it did, we are faced with a choice of strange phrasing, treat the passage how we may.

With less justification R.V. retains *breach* in Jer 14¹⁷, and thereby sadly obscures the figure. There is certainly no reference here to breaches in the walls of the city. Jeremiah's eyes run down with tears, not for a city in ruins, but because the body politic is desperately ill; he sees before him a human figure—the figure of a virgin which stands to him for his nation—‘broken greatly (in body and limb), (wounded) with very grievous wounds.’ He cannot unconcerned look on like those grandees of Samaria who quaffed their wine out of great bowls and used the choicest ointments for their own bodies utterly regardless of the ‘broken (limbs)¹ of Joseph’ (Am 6⁶). Nay, rather, on account of ‘the broken (limbs) of the daughter of his people,’ Jeremiah also ‘is broken,’ i.e. feels himself broken in limb; for so, perhaps, if the text is correct, we should explain Jer 8²¹, though the alternative suggested by Dr. Peake, that the prophet is ‘broken’ (-hearted), is also possible.

Though we speak, for example, of the ‘Sick Man’ of Europe, we do not so readily in speech or writing develop details of the figure in such personifications of a nation as the Hebrews did; and a translation is almost compelled at times to eliminate the personification by the substitution of vaguer terms or by substituting plural pronouns for singulars.² But we certainly ought not even in a translation to be deprived of more of the vividness of the original than is absolutely necessary; and if even the R.V. in Hos 7⁹ happily retains the striking figure of the personified people of Ephraim on whose head grey hairs are here and there appearing, there is no reason why the figure of Judah broken in limb should be concealed or blurred by substituting for terms describing bodily injury vague terms such as affliction, breach, or destruction.

A further passage to be considered is Jer 10¹⁹: here the personified people is represented as the

owner of a tent which has been spoiled and flung down, his children carried off, and he himself left behind beaten and with limbs broken, and therefore incapable of setting up the tent again, or finding any to do so for him. The picture is here expressed in words put into the mouth of the personified people: ‘Woe is me for my broken (limbs)! my wounds are grievous: but I said, Truly this is my ³ sickness, and I must bear it. My tent has been spoiled, and all my cords are broken: my children have gone out from me, and are no more: there is none to stretch forth my tent any more, or to set up my tent-hangings.’ Similarly in Jer 30^{12, 15}, Is 30²⁶, we must substitute for the ‘hurt’ of R.V. some such term as ‘broken (limbs),’ if the passage in translation is to retain the vividness of the original.

The last passage I can discuss here, and perhaps the most striking of all, is Jer 6¹⁴, repeated at 8¹¹. Again the condition of his people is seen by Jeremiah under the figure of a man with broken limbs; neighbours easily assume the rôle of a surgeon; they bind up the broken limbs, it is true; yet they do it carelessly and light-heartedly, with no thought of the shock that the injuries have caused, but ready at once to cry, It is all well again. Both the injured man and the careless healers represent the Jews of Jeremiah’s time: the injured man is the whole nation; the healers are the individuals that compose the nation. A similar double representation occurs in Hos 2²⁽⁴⁾. In this passage the E.V.V. by translating *sheber* by ‘hurt,’ and *shalōm* by ‘peace’ completely obliterate the picture which Jeremiah saw and with a few masterly strokes portrayed. *Shalōm* may, of course, in a suitable context mean *peace*; but what has peace to do here, where bodily injury and the healing of it are in question? Quite clearly, the word is used in its familiar sense of *well (in health)*; as it is, to mention but two passages, in Gn 29⁶ 43²⁷. And then how poor a rendering is ‘hurt’ in such a passage as this. Even if we cannot be quite certain that *sheber* refers to broken *bones* in particular, it certainly does imply some severe bodily injury; it would not, for example, have been applied to a trifling hurt, such as a child receives when it stumbles. And yet if

¹ The word *sheber* here is very inadequately represented by the generalized *affliction* of R.V.

² As e.g. in the R.V. of Jos 9⁷, 1 S 5¹⁰. See more fully the note in my *Commentary on Numbers* (‘International Critical Commentary’), pp. 265 f.

³ Reading ‘לֹא for ‘לֹן. There can be little doubt that ‘לֹן could be used of a person suffering from broken limbs; it is actually used of the condition of Ahaziah when he fell out of the window of his upper chamber (2 K 1²).

Jewish children were like, and treated like, English children, Jeremiah may actually have been using *sheber* in implicit contrast to such trifling hurts. A little child hurts itself, cries, is kissed, and told that all is well again, and is happy; and in this

case all is well. But these people treat the desperate injuries from which Judah is suffering in the same way! ‘They have healed the broken (limbs) of my people lightly, saying, Well (again). Well! (no, indeed!) nothing at all is well.’

Literature.

MODERN RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS IN INDIA.

THE President of the Hartford Theological Seminary, U.S.A., never made a better choice than when he invited the Rev. J. N. Farquhar, M.A., to deliver the Lamson lectures. The subject of the Lamson lectures is the Religions of the World. Mr. Farquhar could not have lectured well on all the Religions of the World. Only a rare scholar, like Professor Moore of Harvard, would dare to lecture or to write on them all. But Mr. Farquhar could lecture on *Modern Religious Movements in India* better than any man living. And he was invited to make that the subject of his lectures and his book (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

He realized the difficulty of his task. But he has spent sixteen years in India studying these movements. He has a singularly keen and orderly mind. He spares neither himself nor his friends in his search for truth. And beyond all else he has the requisite sympathy. The article which he contributed to the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* on the Brahma Samaj introduced him, probably to the President of Hartford, certainly to most of its readers, as an ideal writer on a subject which has not had many writers of any kind.

Whether it is the subject—so near in thought, so far in expression—that attracts us, or whether it is the necessarily abundant element of human life and experience which the book contains, there is no resisting its strong attraction. Perhaps something is due to the clearness of the style and the arrangement of the material. Mr. Farquhar describes first of all those movements which favour serious reform, of which the Brahma Samaj is the chief; next those movements which introduced into the reform some defence of the old faiths, such as the Arya Samaj; then those movements which aimed at out and out defence of the old

religions, of which Theosophy is the most notorious. Here he includes the Sectarian movements in Hinduism and the Caste organizations. Religious Nationalism is the topic of the fifth chapter; Social Reform and Service the subject of the sixth; while the last chapter explains the significance of the movements.

In explaining the significance of the movements, Mr. Farquhar draws our attention to the fact that throughout all the period of reform, say from 1828 till now, there has been a steady advance of the ancient faiths. But he adds—and with his words we shall close this notice—‘The triumphant revival of the old religions, with their growing body-guard of defence organizations, has been accompanied by *continuous and steadily increasing inner decay*. This most significant of all facts in the history of these movements seems to be scarcely perceived by the leaders. They believe that the danger is past. This blindness arises largely from the fact that they draw their apologetic and their inspiration almost entirely from Rāmakrishṇa, Vivekānanda, Sister Niveditā, Dayānanda, and Mrs. Besant; and it is clear that neither capable thinking nor clear-eyed perception can be bred on such teaching as theirs.’

CHRIST IN ART.

It is better, when we have the opportunity, to occupy ourselves with great things than with small, whether it be a text of Scripture or a work of art. A great subject will sometimes rescue a mediocre book from obscurity, of which we have a notable example in Mrs. Jameson’s *History of our Lord in Art*. But when the book really rises to the magnitude of its subject, as is the case with *The Christ of the Men of Art*, by the Rev. J. R. Aitken (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), there is no money that we would not be entitled to spend on the purchase.

The price of this volume is a surprise ; for it contains three hundred and fifty-eight quarto pages of literature, one picture in colour, twenty reproductions in photogravure, and twenty-eight in half-tone. But if it had been published at two or three guineas, as it might have been, we should not have passed it by.

How great the subject is, and how it has attracted the artist and the litterateur—and never without some enrichment of life—may be seen by a glance at the Bibliography which Mr. Aitken has added to his volume. The history of Christ in Art is in a true sense the history of Christian Art. As Mr. Aitken says : ‘ All the world of art has gone after Him, and the greatest and best of the men of art have been strangely drawn to Him. The pathos, the beauty, and power of His life and death have entered the heart of the noblest among them and called forth tribute of gold. It has mattered little that the task has seemed impossible, and that their finest efforts have proved unsatisfying even to themselves. The spell of the Christ has been upon them, and they have given us, from pencil and brush, some of our deepest thoughts of the Son of Man.’

Yes, it is not portraiture only, it is not only an imaginative representation of the face of the Son of Man, that the great artists have given us, it is the expression of their own devotion, and through that expression insight into the mind of Christ, together with an added incentive to the *Imitatio Christi*. The value of Art for interpretation is well brought out by the author of this book. It is not his first object, perhaps, to bring it out. He does not forget that he is giving us a history of the development of Art in relation to its highest effort from century to century. But he never misses the significance of some new feature in a new portrait. It is not simply an added feature. It is not the doing of an individual imagination. It is a new interpretation, a new vision of the Face which makes a fresh appeal to every century, and separately to each seeing soul in it ; but it is along the stream of previous effort, and it carries us a little nearer to the perfection in which we shall see Him as He is. Between ‘ the Christ of Byzantine Art ’ and ‘ the Christ of British Art ’ the way is long, but at every step of it we feel that we are coming nearer to the place where we would be.

Is there an authentic portrait of our Lord in the world ? The question has been much discussed.

Sir Wyke Bayliss occupied many pages of his most interesting book with it. He concluded that there is. Or perhaps it would be more correct to say that he began with that conviction and then pleaded for it. All other writers on the Christ in Art have gone against him, with the exception of Mrs. Henry Jenner. But Mr. Aitken does not dismiss the matter so summarily as others have done. He traces a family likeness, so to say, in portraits of great repute from the fresco in the cemetery of S. Domitilla and the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore. And then he says :

‘ Other portraits in fresco and glass, as well as other lines of “ evidence,” archaeological, artistic, historical, call for attention on the part of those who would settle the question whether or no we have an authentic likeness of our Lord. Enough, perhaps, has been given here to show that the case in favour of such a portrait is not so weak as is sometimes supposed, and that there is no inherent improbability of there ever having been a portrait of our Lord. The art of portrait-painting was quite common in the days of His flesh and throughout the early centuries, and Love is loth to let its loved one fade away. The question of Christ’s divinity can scarcely have troubled the early Christian converts, or the question whether it was right or wise to paint the face of their Friend. The fear of idolatry did not arise and smite the love of Christian men in the golden dawn of the world’s new hope, or the fear of giving to Time a likeness that would lead men to worship a picture of their Lord rather than Christ Himself. It was quite natural for them to desire a portrait of their Lord, and quite in keeping with the deepest and most sacred thoughts of men everywhere to desire to look on the face of One who touched with so kind a hand the deepest and noblest things in the life of the world. Christ stood to the early Christian Church for more than we sometimes think—a great and winning love ; a friendship true and strong as death ; a fine and gracious sacrifice that had no thought of self or fear of woe ; a pity that broke into tears and made the heart tender for ever ; a compassion that sent out its hands and its feet wherever there was sorrow or pain ; strength sufficient to bear all the wounds of life ; and faith that dared to face death’s darkest night, and conquered. He was their Friend, and they painted Him in fresco on their walls, or wore Him in miniature against their beating hearts. He was

their Saviour, and they painted Him in gold on their Communion cups, that they might look on His face when they drank the blood-red wine. He was their Hope, and they painted Him on linen cloths to lay on the darkened faces of their dead. And He was their Comfort and Strength, and they painted, in love, the pitiful, compassionate words of Jesus, His strong, triumphant works, and sang of them, in colour, in the darkest hours of persecution.

'To say all this, however, is not to prove that we have a "portrait" of Christ or that the chain in favour of the traditional "likeness" is complete, but merely to show that the evidence is stronger far than is sometimes admitted, and that there is no inherent improbability of there ever having been a portrait of our Lord. There is point in the taunt: "Men are so slow of heart to believe things concerning Him. They tear the corolla to pieces, not knowing. Their hands are wet with the living sap, and they think it is only from dew that fell an hour ago. They pass through the Catacombs, and observe paintings on the walls by Roman artists, in the Roman style, of a Roman Youth, a Fair Shepherd, an Orpheus, a David; and they say, 'These are imaginary pictures of Christ—these are not likenesses of Christ—we have no likeness of Christ—we have no likeness but that of Cæsar!'"'

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

In issuing *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (T. & T. Clark; 12s.)—the new volume of the 'International Critical Commentary'—Dr. Alfred Plummer tells us that by the death of Dr. Briggs in June 1913 and of Dr. Driver in February 1914, he has been left alone to edit the New Testament volumes. He tells us also that by the ill-health and over-work of Dr. Robertson, Bishop of Exeter, he has been left as the sole author of this volume. Is it then the sense of responsibility, or is it freedom from restraint, that has so acted upon Dr. Plummer as to enable him to produce by far the finest of all the commentaries that he has written? No doubt Dr. Plummer, like all strong men, daily learns to be and do better. But there is a grip of the essential things and an ease in handling the lighter things in this volume which seem to tell of more than normal development.

Perhaps the Epistle has specially appealed to him. That is probable enough. For his work has recently been closely connected with its problems. In any case, this is the work that we shall associate his name with most readily until he lives to give us a greater. Plummer and Robertson on Second Corinthians might have been a good companion to Sanday and Headlam on Romans. But we should have been content with Sanday or with Headlam alone on Romans. We are very well satisfied with Plummer on Second Corinthians.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

With all the books that have been written on the Oxford Movement, the whole story has never been told in English. In French it was told fifteen years ago by Paul Thureau-Dangin. But it is only now that a translation of his great work, *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, has been made. The translation was done by the late Wilfred Wilberforce. It is published in two large octavo volumes by Messrs. Simpkin & Co. (31s. 6d. net).

M. Thureau-Dangin writes from the Roman Catholic side and makes no secret of his attitude. But he is a liberal Roman Catholic. He quotes with unreserved approval the opinion of certain Anglicans who had passed over to Rome, notably Manning, that there were good men left in the Church of England. He says:

'Far from being embarrassed and vexed by this sanctification of their brothers who were separated from them, the Catholics ought, therefore, to have blessed God for it; so that Manning, in 1866, proclaimed his joy at every example of conformity with the Catholic Church shown by the English Church.'

And after quoting from *The Month* an appreciation of Pusey's good faith and saintliness, he says again :

'Here we see the truly Catholic idea, in the light whereof we must regard the evolution which, during more than half a century, has been in progress in the Anglican Church. Let us not lose sight of it. It will enable us without difficulty to do justice to some noble souls; it will help us to retain our hopes, even in face of temporary disappointments; it will give us, as far as we are capable of receiving, a more complete understanding of the designs of Providence.'

From beginning to end the Movement is spoken of in the most laudatory terms. Perhaps we ought to remember that the language of a Frenchman conveys more when turned into our prosaic English tongue than it does to the author and his fellow-countrymen. But, after all, this is the book to read on the Oxford Movement. Let us always hear the best that can honestly be said of movement or of man. Even with Cardinal Manning our author is sympathetic. There are certain episodes in his life with which he has difficulty, but he gives Manning the benefit always. Once at least he ignores the very plain account of Manning's treachery regarding Newman's cardinal's hat which is given not only in Manning's but also in Newman's biography. And you would never discover from M. Thureau-Dangin that Manning persecuted his more distinguished rival successfully throughout the pontificate of Pius ix. It is all due to his consideration for Manning, not to dislike of Newman. Perhaps he does not idolize Newman quite as others have done, historians as well as disciples. But he does not fail (how could he?) to make him a greater man as well as a greater saint than Manning.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has discovered a historian. The Rev. James MacCaffrey, Ph.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, wrote some time ago a *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, which was well received. He has now written a *History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution* (Gill; 2 vols., 12s. 6d. net). The new book will decide any doubter. Professor MacCaffrey is unmistakably a historian.

The title is not well chosen. The limits indicated by it are transgressed, sometimes by excess, sometimes by defect. Moreover, very great disparity exists in the treatment of countries. The history of the Catholic Church in Scotland from the Renaissance to the French Revolution is dismissed in rather less than fifty pages; while Ireland receives more than two hundred. Of course this disparity is easily understood. Dr. MacCaffrey writes as a Roman Catholic and an Irishman. And it is easily forgiven. He knows Ireland best; it is right that he should take space

to tell what he knows best. We are not at all astonished to find that the very style rises in grandeur and increases in warmth as soon as the history of Ireland is entered upon.

It is a capable history throughout. Not un-pardonably prejudiced, even when Luther is mentioned, Professor MacCaffrey has taken pains with his sources and felt responsibility for his facts. If his style is never distinguished, it never falls below clearness and comfort. If we are never roused to enthusiasm, we are never deprived of quiet enjoyment.

What do we know of Ruysbroeck? As much as Maeterlinck tells us in his *Ruysbroeck and the Mystics* (so well translated by Miss Stoddart). There are a few other things in English—translations, selections, and magazine articles. But our knowledge is so limited that an independent study of the great mystic, as a man, together with an exposition of his leading doctrines, now offered by Miss Evelyn Underhill in 'The Quest Series,' under the title of *Ruysbroeck* (Bell; 2s. 6d. net), is most welcome. Miss Underhill's skill in making the abstruse concrete and the complex simple is here seen at its highest exercise.

The difficult but irresistible subject of telepathy is handled scientifically by Mr. J. C. F. Grumbine under the title of *Telepathy; or, The Science of Thought Transference* (Fowler & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). The book is an argument against materialism. For whatever thought is, and however it is transferred from one person to another, it is not a product of the brain. 'Telepathy,' says Mr. Grumbine, '—which literally means, sympathy from afar—and thought transference—which is a psychic process (not organic) of conducting thought from one mind to another—are established upon the a priori mode of generating and transmitting thought by divine inspiration. If God or the self in each one inspires the soul from within and not from without, by a deductive rather than an inductive method, that inspiration is not organic but spiritual. Telepathy is a science of mental as well as spiritual processes of thought transference.'

Mr. Grumbine is the author of a book on *Clairvoyance* which is issued by the same publishers (2s. 6d. net). This book tells us less about science and more about divinity. The divinity of which it tells us is the divinity of man, round which a

complete philosophical system is built up and called 'The System of Philosophy concerning Divinity.'

Mr. E. S. Buchanan, M.A., B.Sc., is rapidly building up a great reputation as an editor of Biblical texts. He has already edited and issued *The Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis*, *The Four Gospels from the Codex Veronensis*, *The Epistles and Apocalypse from the Codex Harleianus* (1772, B.M.), *The Epistle of St. Paul from the Codex Laudianus* (Lat. 108, Bodleian), and *The Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse from the Codex Laudianus* (Lat. 43, Bodl.). Now he gives us an edition in Latin (21s. net) and in English (3s. 6d. net) of *The Four Gospels from the Latin Text of the Irish Codex Harleianus*, numbered Harl. 1023 in the British Museum Library (Heath, Cranton, & Ouseley).

Mr. Buchanan has much faith in the Versions. He does not think that Westcott and Hort's text is at all to be relied on. How could it be, he asks, when it is based on a single manuscript which is itself a revision? He agrees with Nestle (of whom he speaks enthusiastically) that for the primitive text we must study especially the Old-Latin Versions and the Sahidic (Egyptian) Version. Now there are certain Irish MSS. in the British Museum, gathered by Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, and his son Edward, which present an Old-Latin text. Their text is not purely Old-Latin, because, when the Vulgate reached Ireland, the Old-Latin MSS. were more or less altered into conformity with it. Mr. Buchanan has transcribed one of these MSS. *verbatim et literatim*, and had it printed in a beautiful type and enriched with two collotype facsimiles. But in translating the MS. he has used other MSS. where in the MS. he was translating he suspected alteration in conformity with the Vulgate. Thus the translation he offers is as nearly as he can make it that of the Old-Latin Version as represented by Irish Manuscripts.

The difference between this MS. and the Vulgate is sometimes considerable. Take two verses: 'And seeing Him they were amazed; and His mother said to Him, Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with me? Behold, I have sought Thee sorrowing. And He said to His mother, How is it that thou soughtest Me?'

'Whose soever sins ye remit, it is the Holy Spirit That shall remit them; and whose soever

sins ye retain, it is the Holy Spirit That shall retain them.'

Numbers 128 to 133 of the 'People's Books' have been issued, and every one is a war book (Jack; 6d. net each). A history of *The Hohenzollerns* has been written by the Rev. A. D. Innes; *Treitschke*, the amazing product of *kultur*, has been characterized by Mr. Maximilian A. Mügge; *Belgium* is described by Mr. Frank Maclean; the capture of *Germany* by militarism is brought out clearly, though incidentally, by Mr. W. T. Waugh in the course of his six chapters, the last of which tells us what German Culture really is; Captain A. H. Atteridge puts into our hands a most convenient account of *The British Army of To-day*; and Mr. W. M. Conacher, a Canadian, helps the British soldier to converse with his French and Belgian comrades by means of *A French Self-Tutor*.

There is not a single sermon on the War in the Rev. William Wakinshaw's volume entitled *John's Ideal City* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net); and for that not a few will be thankful. Every sermon carries the Message of the Gospel, and is content. That message is made vivid by illustration and impressive by the speaker's manifest earnestness.

The most useful bit of work that Dr. Emil Reich did in all his restless life was the publication of *Select Documents illustrating Mediaeval and Modern History*. The book was published in 1905. A cheap edition has been issued this spring (P. S. King; 7s. 6d. net). It contains first of all the great international treaties, from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 to the Second Peace of Paris in 1815. A much longer section is occupied with the documents of Church History. It begins with the Edict of Milan (313) and ends with the Bull 'Pastor Aeternus' of 1870, embodying the Papal Infallibility decree. Then follow the great deeds and documents of the Middle Ages according to the country of their birth. The book will now become better known and will be accepted as a most useful aid to the writer and the reader of History, both sacred and profane.

The Rev. Alexander Webster, formerly Unitarian minister in Aberdeen, has, in his retirement, published a history of the progress of theology in

Scotland. He calls it *Theology in Scotland, reviewed by a Heretic* (Lindsey Press). That means, presumably, that he feels himself out of touch with the prevalent theology, which no doubt he is. It also means that he criticizes it. But his criticism is kindly enough, and if it does no good, which would be a pity, it will do no harm. Mr. Webster signs the preface on his 75th birthday. But he does not claim the vigour which is everywhere felt throughout it; that is due to the fact that it is a gathering together of addresses made, and sometimes published, in the course of his ministry.

A handsome and attractively illustrated book, entitled *Footfalls of Indian History* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), has been published. The author is Sister Niveditā. When the Swami Vivekānanda visited England, he was joined by Miss Margaret Noble, who took the name of Sister Niveditā, or the 'dedicated one.' If you will turn to Mr. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India*, you will read that 'Vivekānanda's English disciple, Sister Niveditā, settled in a small Hindu house in the northern part of Calcutta, and lived there a life of simple service for several years, visiting the Hindu homes around about her, conducting a school for girls in her own house, and leading young Hindus into practical service. She was a woman of deep romantic feeling and of considerable literary power. She readily picked up her master's method of glorifying Hinduism and Hindu life, and far exceeded him. Her chief work, *The Web of Indian Life*, shows, on the one hand, most remarkable sympathy with both the ideals and the actualities of Hindu life, and proves to every capable reader what a priceless help towards interpretation sympathy is, but, on the other hand, contains such exaggerated language in praise of Hindu customs and institutions, that many orthodox Hindus have protested against the book as altogether untrustworthy and as thoroughly unhealthy reading for young Hindus themselves. Yet Sister Niveditā had her reward. Though her book is unwise, she loved the Hindu people and served them; and they gave her their love. At her death, in October, 1911, there was an extraordinary outburst of feeling in the Hindu community of Bengal.'

This is the author of the new book. We are not told why it was not published till now. It consists of a number of independent chapters, some of which describe famous Indian places, and

some discuss difficult Indian problems. All are written from the Hindu point of view, and all manifest strong sympathy with those places and ideas to which the Hindu heart clings. Behar and Benares are two of the places described; the Final Recension of the Mahabharata and the Rise of Vaishnavism under the Guptas are two of the problems discussed.

On a great subject read a great book. The book to read on *The Family* is Mrs. Helen Bosanquet's. It has just been reissued by Messrs. Macmillan (8s. 6d. net). The history of the family fills the first half of it; the second half is occupied with a philosophical account of the modern family. At the present moment the chapter of most interest, and perhaps of most service, is that on the Psychology of Family Life. But every chapter deserves, as it demands, the most painstaking study.

The problem of Church-going is acute in this country. It is more acute in the United States of America. Volume after volume is written and read about it, and all sorts of methods are invented to meet the mischief. One of the best books has been written by the Rev. Paul Moore Strayer. It is entitled *The Reconstruction of the Church* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). There are two ways in which the Church needs reconstruction—as to its message and as to its method.

Its message must be made more social. Mr. Strayer thinks it cannot be made *too* social. It must bring men together in Christ, and it must keep them together in business. He lays great emphasis on the necessity of business life being brought within the influence of the Church. And it is pleasant to see that so observant a man has great hope of the result. Already deeds are being done under Church influence which would, not long ago, have been undreamt of. He gives this example:

'A new moral standard and a new idealism in dealing with inventors was set by the Eastman Kodak Company in the summer of this year, 1914. Henry J. Gaisman discovered how to sign and date a film at the time the picture is taken. He is reported to have said that he would have taken \$10,000 for his work, and have "jumped at" \$50,000. Mr. Eastman paid him \$300,000. First, Mr. Eastman fixed an adequate salary for

the four years during which the inventor had worked on his device, and that amount was doubled. Then the cost of the laboratory was agreed upon, and the amount doubled. To this total enough was added to make \$300,000, not on the basis of what the device cost the inventor, but of its value in expected profits to the company. This marks a new era for inventors and for business ethics.'

Of the new methods Mr. Strayer has a great variety. One of them is advertising. Every large church should take a page advertisement in a leading paper at least once a week. More than that, its affairs should be in the hands of a good advertising agent always, just as the affairs of a newspaper are. Yet it is a restrained, well-considered, and well-written book.

In spite of the loud and apparently concerted attempt to throw ridicule on the study of Eugenics, that science, yet in its infancy, has a great future before it. There is no difficulty in understanding the offence it gives. Any science that touches heredity touches the conscience of the better and the convenience of the baser sort. Does Eugenics suggest that alcohol or immorality or overcrowding has to do with mental or physical weakness in offspring? That is enough. The mighty and well-disciplined army called 'the Trade' mobilizes at once, and it is reinforced by the scattered forces of the other trades that traffic in bodies and souls. It will be well for the follower of Christ to determine to make Eugenics a particular study, however painful that study may be.

A valuable contribution to its literature has been made by Dr. Henry Herbert Goddard. The book is published under the title of *Feeble-mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences* (Macmillan Company; \$4 net). There is a training school for feeble-minded boys and girls at Vineland, New Jersey. Some time ago the Superintendent of the School promoted the establishment of a department of research. Of that department Dr. Goddard is the director, and this book is the first result of the research work.

It is to some extent a technical work. But the author has recognized the widespread interest that is taken in the subject, and has seen how useful to society it may be if the truth about feeble-mindedness and its causes could be made generally known. He has accordingly written as far as he possibly

could in such a way that the 'layman' might understand. Thus, for example, he has given a clear exposition of what Mendelism means, though no doubt the biologist will think it unnecessary. In this way he carries the uninstructed fathers and mothers of the next generation with him, surely to their instruction if discomfort, and to the mighty advantage of the children that are to be born.

It is in many respects a trying book to read. Its many photographs are trying to look at. But there is encouragement in it, so much of the evil that exists being shown to be due to ignorance.

That there is a great revival of prayer since the War began is recognized. But it has not yet revived the Prayer-Meeting appreciably. It is the belief of the Rev. William T. Ward that the fault is with the Prayer-Meeting leader. He has written a manual for leaders. And by the very title he shows what the leader has to think about; for the title is *Variety in the Prayer-Meeting* (Methodist Book Concern; 50 cents net).

The best of the preachers in the United States are greatly under the influence of the Social Movement. The Rev. Charles W. Barnes in his book *Social Messages* (Methodist Book Concern; 50 cents) calls the recognition of brotherhood a new sanctification. He then proceeds to show how social was the message of certain great preachers of the past—Wesley, Kingsley, Maurice, Robertson—and ends with his conception of the social message of the modern preacher and how the modern church may open the way for it.

The Bible and Life (Methodist Book Concern; \$1 net) is the first series of the Mendenhall Lectures. They were delivered at De Pauw University, by the Right Rev. Edwin Holt Hughes, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishop Hughes has dropped none of the old-fashioned simple love of the Bible, and he has dropped none of the Bible. He finds it the best guide for life in all the world. With much loving anxiety he tells us what the Bible has to say about Man, Home, Education, Work, Wealth, Sorrow, and Practice. Of all the chapters, that on Sorrow will be most treasured. For whatever else the Bible is, it is a comforter.

A new edition has been published of *The Gospel*

of Healing, by the Rev. A. B. Simpson, D.D. (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net). It is not a mere reprint, though a mere reprint is sometimes called a new edition; it has been revised and in some parts rewritten. For example, reference is made to the Conference of Representatives of the Clerical and Medical Professions which was held at the Chapter House of St. Paul's Cathedral, to discuss the asserted results and the rapid development of Spiritual and Faith-healing movements.

It is easy to say commonplace things about the Seven Words, and many a man has been satisfied so to do. Not the Bishop of Ossory. In his *Verba Crucis* (Mowbray; 1s. net) Dr. J. H. Bernard has given first a life's discerning experience and then special study to each of the Seven Words from the Cross, and every address has meaning and power in it. On the Cry of Derection he seems to say what may be said, neither less nor more.

The Rev. Robert Keable has written a careful exposition of *The Loneliness of Christ* (Nisbet; 1s. 6d. net), and has been able to redeem a popular subject from barren repetition.

The Holy Land in Geography and in History (Partridge; 5s. net) is a republication in one volume of two little volumes which have been the precious possession of students of the Bible for several years. The preciousness is not in the Geography or in the History, though they are both good, but in the maps. The most wonderful series of beautiful little maps are here—maps of every bit of country, maps of every physical feature, maps of every historical period and every historical place—one hundred and forty-five maps in all.

It is to be expected of an American lawyer—if he should condescend to give his mind to things theological—that he should discover the centrality of faith. For it is central. But it needs the trained eye and the disciplined will to see that. In *The Law of Faith* (Putnams; \$1.50 net) this lawyer (Mr. Joseph F. Randolph) shows that in the Bible faith is not only central but all-controlling. He takes 'Faith in God,' and tells us what the Bible has to say about it. He does the same with 'Faith in Christ.' He takes 'Belief about Christ,' and tells us what the Bible has to say about that. He does

the same with 'Faith in Word, Prophet, and Miracle.' And, to complete the subject, he tells us what the Bible has to say about Faithfulness—the Faithfulness of God and the Faithfulness of Man. Then at the end of the book he gives a complete list of all the places in the Bible where faith, or anything that has to do with faith, is referred to.

That there are many idle and ignorant people in the world to-day, people whose whole aim in life is to see and hear some new thing, is made painfully and shamefully evident by the encouragement given in Europe and in America to the missionaries of Hinduism. If these missionaries were not themselves idle and ignorant they would not be missionaries of Hinduism. Their ignorance is very deep indeed. A book has been published by Messrs. Putnam, under the title of *Hinduism in Europe and America* (5s. net), which makes an exposure of its appalling depth. 'If they would take the trouble to read the Gospels,' says the author, 'it might save them from the blunder of asserting that certain things "were borrowed from the sacred books of India" which are not to be found in either the one or the other!'

'What can we say, for instance, when it is declared that "The Holy Ghost descended upon Mary in the form of a dove"? And that "this statement was taken from the Bhagavad-gita"?

'It is confidently declared that "Jesus of Nazareth borrowed his morals, his doctrines, and even his name from one Jezeus Christna of the Hindus"!

'The name of Krishna is thus misspelled apparently for the purpose of confounding his name with that of the Messiah. But the word Christ means "anointed," while Krishna means "black" or "dark-coloured." The vast difference in the signification of the names makes it impossible for scholars to suspect any kinship between the two.'

'And yet, in defiance of all the principles of philology, one author declares: "In Sanskrit, Kristna, or rather Christna, signifies 'messenger of God, promised of God, sacred,' etc." If he had known the meaning of the word Christ he would of course have said that "Christna in Sanskrit means 'anointed'!"'

'Another of the same class, and equally ignorant, asserts: "Christna as well as Buddha [enlightened]

means shepherd"! Still another of the same reckless sort declares: "Krishna means the sun"!

'In relation to Jezeus, one author pretends to quote from the Bhagavad-gita as follows: "They named him Jezeus, that is to say, the pure divine essence"! Of course there is nothing of the kind in the Gita, from one end to the other, but on another page of the same book we are assured: "The name of Jesus, or Jezeus, was in ancient India the consecrated epithet assigned to all incarnations"!

'The truth is, however, that there is no such name as Jezeus in Sanskrit—no name like it in the language, and Max Müller declares that "*it was simply invented*" by the author in question.'

The author of this book—Elizabeth A. Reed, A.M.—has done right well not to be merciful. The only fear is that the disease is too radical for even her knife.

The Child and the Nation, by Grace M. Paton (1s. net), gives an account of what is being done in elementary schools for the physical welfare of children. It is published by the Student Christian Movement (93 Chancery Lane, W.C.), for whom it has been directly written.

The number of indispensable books of reference is not large if one could but find the right books. One of them is *The English Catalogue of Books*, of which the volume for 1914 has been published (Office of the Publishers' Circular; 7s. 6d. net). And it is improving in usefulness every year: it is a more nearly complete record of the year's publications, and its entries are more accurate. It was not conspicuously inaccurate before; but the errors that are so hard to keep out of masses of names and titles and dates and prices now very rarely occur. When we add that the printing is clean and not too crowded we have said all that is necessary.

The Use of the Old Testament.

BY THE REV. J. A. F. GREGG, D.D., PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

'The Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.'—² Ti 3¹⁵.

ST. PAUL is here speaking of the Old Testament. That was the only Bible he knew. The Old Testament was the Bible of our Lord and the Bible of the early Church. And how heavily both our Lord in the days of His flesh, and the Church of Apostolic days leant upon this Bible of theirs, may be seen by reference to the New Testament.

Jesus of Nazareth framed His life upon the lines laid down for Him in the Old Testament. It was His court of appeal. It was His armoury in moments of temptation. And so with the Apostles: the New Testament (it has been well said) is written in terms of the Old Testament. These matters are beyond doubt. For the Lord and His Apostles the Old Testament was an authority recognized and proved, and, as such, it is commended to us who come after. Not in itself, but through faith which is in Christ Jesus it is able to make us wise unto salvation.

But it may well be asked if the Old Testament does serve this purpose for Christian men of to-day. Do not men rather fight shy of it? Are they quite sure of it? Is it not the case that the rather free handling to which the Old Testament has been subjected has lessened the deference with which it should be approached?

I think there can be little doubt that this is so; the Old Testament does not hold the place in men's minds that it once did. But this is wrong. Nothing has occurred to shake the authority of the Old Testament in the least degree. Whatever authority it had for the Lord and His Apostles was spiritual; it was connected with the deepest religious import of the Old Testament: and whatever it was to them, it was, not because they read into it something that was not there; not because, being Jews, they dared not challenge its venerable wisdom; but because the same Spirit of God who had inspired its writers long before was now inspiring them, and was quickening their vision to see the truth of God that lay in its heart. And

this truth which they saw in it was eternal truth, the truth that is true in every age, truth that is as true for us as ever it was to them. And it is only when you and I see the Old Testament as a vehicle of this truth, when we look for this truth in it and find it, that the Old Testament will be to us the strength and illumination that it is meant to be.

But how can this be? I am asked. You contend for the historicalness of the New Testament with an urgency which you never display in connexion with the Old Testament. The Bible is one, and yet you do not treat it as one. When you deal with reported miracles in the Old Testament, you seem to explain them away; on the other hand, you expend considerable time and labour in defending the miracles of the New Testament. You are not consistent; you don't encourage us to trust the Old Testament. Such an objection can, I know, be put forward. But I do not think it is valid. It might be valid if the purpose of the Old Testament and of the New Testament was identical; but inasmuch as their object is different, and the Old Testament aims at one thing and the New Testament at another, the objection cannot be pressed.

For what the Old Testament aims at doing is this, to bring before us the growing religious light which shone through Israel; to present us with the development of the religious ideas which influenced the people: on the other hand, it is not so much ideas as facts, historical facts which belong to a definite moment in time; it is with these that the New Testament is concerned.

The Christian religion is above all things a historic religion, a religion resting upon facts of history, and we cannot say quite the same of Judaism. The Person of Christ, as revealed at a given point in time, is the definite burden of the New Testament. Christ, born among men as the Incarnation of the Divine Word, Christ the Sacrifice for sin upon the Cross, Christ the Conqueror of Death through a miraculous Resurrection, Christ the Renewer of His Church through the Holy Spirit sent from heaven; why, here we have a historic revelation, the very essence of which is its association with place and time.

But what has the Old Testament to show by the side of this? There is no person, or event, by which the Old Testament finally stands or falls. It is not the historicalness of its events, it is its

religious ideas, which make the Old Testament the sacred treasure-house that it is. And the difference between what we look for in the Old Testament (viz. religious ideas) and what we look for in the New Testament (viz. the history of a Person) is forced upon us by the difference in the character of the Old Testament and the New. The historical books of the New Testament, e.g. the Synoptic Gospels, date from within thirty or forty years of the events recorded, and are based on sources which might almost be called contemporary. But the case is very different with the historical books of the Old Testament. Hundreds of years (and in some cases a thousand years or more) separate the writing of the records from the events which they record. That is to say, though there is no doubt a very large skeleton of historical fact underlying the Old Testament documents, there is nothing to show that much of the flesh (as it were) with which the bones are covered is literal history, and may not be due to the reflexion and pious imagination of subsequent ages. E.g. where questions of miracle are involved, it is natural (and it is right) to approach a religious document with a presumption against those apparent breaches of uniformity which we call miracles. Very strong contemporary evidence is required if we are to overcome our antecedent hesitation. We go to the New Testament and find that the contemporary evidence for miracle there is as strong as for the commonplace, and that we cannot excise the miracles from the evidence without discrediting the evidence for everything. And accordingly in the New Testament we have to say that the testimony *for* miracle is so strong that our presumption *against* miracle must give way.

But how different it is in the Old Testament! What is the evidence for miracle there? It is, in comparison, very slender.

It would ill become a believer in the supernatural to say that no evidence for the miraculous that it produces would be strong enough to overcome our antecedent objections. There are instances of prophetic prediction, e.g., which it is very hard to make anything of except on the assumption that they are genuine. But, for all that, there are very many stories of miracle in the Old Testament for which the evidence as it stands is insufficient. It is not on the ground that God could not have done them that we hesitate: it is on the ground that we have not sufficient evidence

to assure us that He did, as a matter of fact, do them. No man could be called, with any fairness, a sceptic because he was not coerced by the evidence offered for the miracles connected with the Exodus, or with the record of Elijah and Elisha, or with the story of Balaam, or with the Books of Jonah and Daniel. The literary evidence for the supernormal there is simply insufficient.

It is curious to notice how, when we handle what are more or less contemporary documents in the Old Testament, such as the Books of Amos and Hosea, the miraculous is almost entirely absent: it seems only to make its appearance in those cases where time has been given for the imagination of religious thinkers to play around the stories of heroes of old time.

But does not this view of the Old Testament miracles rob the Old Testament of its power and its divineness? When the Book of God speaks of miraculous intervention, and you disallow this intervention, you are reducing God's word to the level of a human composition, and a somewhat unreliable one at that. This might indeed be said with strong reason, were the Old Testament but one book, were it but the composition of a day, and were it composed with but one deliberate purpose, namely, the production of belief in certain methods of God's working. But what is the Old Testament? It is not a single book, it is a library of many books. It is not the product of a day, it represents the growth of centuries. From the human point of view, it is a collection of fragments, which have grown together, not under the influence of any one presiding editor, but by reason of their native homogeneity. This accretion-process was not directed by any theological policy; it was due to the silent action of the religious life of a nation, which treasures the memorials of its past. And when this nation is the Jewish nation, whose history (in spite of all deductions on literary grounds) is plainly stamped as shaped by the special constraint of Providence, and whose prophets heard the voice of God speaking as no others of their age heard it, is it to be wondered at if the religious consciousness of this nation reflects itself spontaneously in its literature?

The story of the nation and its heroes is told over in the homes. It is pondered in private, it is expounded and amplified in public. Expansions and embellishments gradually attach themselves to the story as it is handed on: the religious experi-

ence of the people finds expression in tales of wonderful works, which the fathers tell the children, and which their faith in God, childlike and full of wonder, has no hesitation in crediting. And gradually, without any conscious intention, the new is incorporated with the old, and legend becomes indistinguishable from history.

And God is able to use this collection of national memorials for making men wise unto salvation through faith in Christ. How? Because it reflects the inspiration of His inspired people. What was it that threw back upon the records so much of this element of wonders and signs? It was their religious experience, which could only attribute to God supernatural power because of their rooted and well-justified belief in Him. The religious experience which pondered over the nation's history and elaborated it all unconsciously is a fact, and the Old Testament exists far more to reflect and register that solid spiritual fact and to commend it to us for our spiritual support, than to speak to us of miracles in the physical world.

Treat the Old Testament as a mirror, a mirror reflecting a national religious experience, a mirror reflecting the religious ideas held by the people which were spontaneously thrown back upon the records that came down the years with the people, and which were only thrown back upon the records because those ideas were so living and real to the people itself; treat the Old Testament as a mirror of the nation's religious experience, and you have a position from which you can approach the Old Testament to indefeasible spiritual profit. For then, the thing you look for is not bald history, but the marvellous religious faith which colours and heightens all it touches.

You tell me you like facts, that you distrust history which contains events that possibly never happened. But I ask you, is not religious experience a fact? Was it any other kind of fact that caused the Old Testament to come into being, and that makes it to be the book that it is? Is not the vitalizing and unifying thread that runs through its series of fragments the faith of the successive generations of the Hebrews? Is not this faith the constitutive fact of the Old Testament? and, by its side, are not the items of a miraculous kind incidental and secondary? We need to learn to weigh the values of facts: the faith of the Hebrews is as much greater than the miracle-narratives in which that faith at times

reflects itself, as the lighthouse beam that pierces the night is greater than the mechanism of the lighthouse lamp.

If we remember this, the Old Testament can be to us once more a book of Divine truth. We shall be able to get back once again to the simplicity with which the Apostles used it. They knew nothing of criticism, nor did they need to know anything. The Old Testament was to them a book of spiritual experience, revealing the very heart of the ancient people of God. It was a spiritual book framed around a history. Its object was for them not so much information as edification: its purpose was not so much history as a religious interpretation of history. What was written, was written for their admonition. And so every individual in it represented a type of character, every event in it impressed its own lesson; and the lesson was true, equally true whether the narrative were historical fact or idealization. For what counts is the truth suggested through the narrative. Parable can convey truth as surely as history can. We don't ask if Macbeth or Faust are reproductions point by point of historical fact. And our Lord Himself by His use of parable showed that He recognized the value of truth embodied in a tale. Has the story of His temptation anything the less to teach us, if we view it as a symbolic apologue, than if we treat it as a record of three successive concrete experiences? And so with the Old Testament. The less we talk about Biblical criticism, we who have to teach from the Bible, the better. Criticism is pedantic, dry, analytical. But it has one great lesson for us, and that is that the Bible is literature, *Eastern* literature: and if we learn that lesson, we shall turn from the worship of the letter to the search for the spirit.

The letter kills, but the spirit gives life. And when we exercise faith, the faith in Christ Jesus that St. Paul speaks of in the text, then it is that the Old Testament can make us wise unto salvation. And by 'faith' he does not mean the obstinate irrationality which persists in saying, 'Whatever criticism may teach, I am going to adhere to my belief that all the miracles happened exactly as they are said to have done'—by 'faith' he means the spiritual vision which has no time to waste on such irrelevant questions, but pierces down (as did Christ and the Apostles) below the circumstance to the truth, through the husk to the

kernel, behind the form of the book to its purpose. 'Faith' tracks down the broad principles, seeks out the religious ideas, and finds itself quite unharassed by such questions as, 'Did Balaam's ass speak?' 'Did the whale swallow Jonah?'

I might conclude what I have to say by a reference to the latter incident. Educated men can hardly speak of Jonah now without self-consciousness. They feel that if they speak of Jonah they are committing themselves to a profession of belief in the literal historicity of the whole story. And as they don't believe in it, the less said about Jonah the better.

Now this is a very unfortunate attitude. There is hardly a finer piece of Christianity in the Old Testament than the teaching of the Book of Jonah, and very few people have the least idea that it is there. Jonah is a sealed book: people are frightened by the whale.

But let us view the matter in the light I have been suggesting, and let us fearlessly acknowledge that the Book of Jonah is a dramatic composition, and that the whale is not the story, but the least important part of it, merely part of the furnishing of the stage; and we may recover for our spiritual use one of the most striking lessons in broad-hearted philanthropy in the Bible, fit to stand by the Parable of the Good Samaritan or of the Prodigal Son.

Jonah is called to go and preach to heathen Nineveh, but as a Jew he resents this opening of the heart of God to the non-Jew. He flees from the duty; and in the great storm we see punishment following him, and in the whale we see the instrument of God's deliverance of Jonah from the extremity of punishment. The solitary importance of the 'great fish that God prepared' is as representing God's care pursuing Jonah in his sin, and saving him from himself. We get an illustration of our slavery to the letter when with prosaic clumsiness we let the whale suggest to us the miraculous, instead of (what poetically it stands for) the Divine care.

And here, for most people, the story of Jonah ends: but it has only just begun. Jonah is saved from his narrow ungenerousness, and is once again sent on his mission to heathen Nineveh. This time he goes, and he preaches, and heathen Nineveh repents. But he is still the old hard-hearted Jew; like Pharisees of a later day he rebukes God in his heart for His regard for the

outcast and the sinner. So he sits down and sulks. And the last chapter of Jonah gives us the picture of the prophet, being sheltered by a gourd which grows up to hide him from the heat, and displaying his pitying indignation over its sudden destruction by a worm.

The prophet protests that he does well to be angry over this piece of ruthless destruction : and the story finds its climax in the last words of the book : 'Thou hast had pity on the gourd, which came up in a night, and perished in a night : and should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand ; and also much cattle ?'

The Book of Jonah is full of the impossible—many other impossible things beside the whale. But it is full of truth ; its rebuke of religious jealousy and selfish particularism makes one thankful it is in the Old Testament in spite of all the silly jests for which the accessories of the story have made our religion the butt.

Jonah will serve to illustrate an important principle. The Old Testament is Eastern literature. Read it as Western history, and you will find yourself hard put to defend it : read it as an Eastern vehicle of truth, existing not for itself but for the truth it conveys ; read it for yourselves, and you will find it can indeed make you wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

The Idealist Reaction against Science.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. JAMES IVERACH, D.D., ABERDEEN.

The Idealistic Reaction against Science, by Professor Aliotta, Royal University of Padua, has been translated by Agnes McCaskill, and published by Messrs. Macmillan (12s. net). The point of view of Professor Aliotta may be best described in his own words, as given in the preface : 'The line of thought adopted by me defends the rights of the scientific method and of natural reality against the facile denials of the Neo-Hegelians. Idealism, which came into vogue in Italy after the decline of positivism, now appears to be on the wane, and the abuse of the dialectic method has resulted in such a confusion of ideas in mental science that Croce himself recently lifted his voice against these exaggerations. It is now time to return to realism, and in England, America, and Germany there are already indications of such a return, which this work of mine would fain hasten in Italy, where, if absolute idealism has attained a large measure of success, other vigorous and original currents of thought, which have disputed the victory with it, are by no means lacking.' The excellent translation by Miss McCaskill has enabled us to read this book, and has placed us on a level with the Italian reader. We are glad that the translation, so competent in every way, has appeared. For it is a notable addition to our philosophic literature. It is sure to be closely

studied, and it deserves the closest study. In view of the large place which Idealism holds in contemporary literature, and of the place which it holds in our University teaching, it is well that a treatise on the scale of the present one, and a treatise of the conspicuous learning and ability which mark the work of Professor Aliotta, should be in the hands of the British reader. It is well also that we in these islands should be made aware of the philosophic work which is being done in Italy. Thanks to Dr. Ainslie, we have become acquainted with Croce, and here we have another Italian of high merit brought within our reach. All students will welcome this notable work in its English dress.

As we read and ponder over the contents of the volume, the first thing that strikes us is the wide learning and voluminous reading of the author. Many philosophers are well read in philosophical literature, and are not well equipped in science or in literature. Many of them too are limited in their reading to one or two languages. But Professor Aliotta is as well read in the literature of science as he is in philosophy. He is also acquainted with the whole range of contemporary literature, and the works of the great contemporary writers in philosophy and science are known to him, whether they have written in Italian, in

German, in French, or in English. He has given particular attention to the works of philosophers of all schools, and, what is unusual, he has dealt in detail with the new theories of mathematics and physics. It is not often that one reads a book of so wide a range, and so precise and accurate in all that it touches. It has not been our good fortune to meet such a book since we read Merz's *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. No doubt Merz is historical and expository, and Aliotta is expository and critical, but both writers are like in the wide range of their knowledge, and in the accuracy of their delineation.

After an introductory chapter in which he sets forth the reaction from intellectualism in contemporary philosophy, and describes the history of intellectualism and anti-intellectualism in philosophy, and sets forth the causes of the present reaction against intellectualism, he proceeds to his main task. It consists of two main parts: in one he discusses in detail the reaction from intellectualism in the new theories of knowledge; in the other he discusses the new theories of Mathematics; and in conclusion he gives the outlines of a spiritualistic conception of the world. We hope that some day he will enlarge this conclusion into a separate treatise, and work it out in detail.

Returning to the first part, he divides it into two sections—the first of which sketches the beginnings of the reaction from intellectualism, and the second the reaction itself in its full-blown vigour. Agnostic Positivism is the movement in which Aliotta discerns the beginning of the reaction. He deals with the Ignorabimus of Du Bois-Reymond, and with the Unknowable of Spencer. Agnosticism is the inevitable consequence of the traditional mathematical method. The following sentence is worth quoting: 'Spencer's System with its theory of the Unknowable, appealing to a belief, a feeling beyond conception, with its doctrine of the evolutionary intuition of the universe, discrediting, as it does, the traditional mathematical attitude, and putting science at the service of biological adaptationalism not only pregnant with the crisis of scientific intellectualism, but unfolds the first germs of that reaction whose development we shall follow as it strives in various ways to escape from the difficult position in which agnosticism has placed it.' It is an interesting task to follow the development through the fascinating pages of Professor Aliotta. Unfortunately that is not possible in any

reasonable notice. We can only indicate certain points in this evolution. Neo-Criticism, Voluntaryism, and the Primacy of Practical Reason is the title of the next chapter, and in it he deals with Lange, Helmholtz, Riehl, Wundt, and Von Hartmann. The statement of the positions taken by these and the criticism of them are admirable. But the interest grows when in the same chapter he deals with Fouillée, Paulsen, Nietzsche, Lotze, and specially with the phenomenism of Renouvier. The criticism of these authors and of their schemes is as admirable as is the accurate knowledge of them, and the recognition of the place they fill in the history of thought. Empiro-Criticism is the next theme, and perhaps the most interesting part of it is that which deals with Hodgson and Kleinpetz. But British readers will eagerly turn to the following chapter, which deals with English Neo-Hegelianism. We have been rather proud of Hutchison Stirling, the Cairds, Green, to speak only of those who have gone before. But Stirling and the Cairds are scarcely mentioned, and the names which occur are those of Green, Bradley, and McTaggart. This chapter also we must pass by in comparative silence, for to deal with it adequately would take more space than can be granted to us. Only the reader must not neglect it, for it is important.

In the chapters on The Doctrine of Contingency and Intuitionism, on Anglo-American Pragmatism, and on the Philosophy of Values and the Historic Method, which constitute the second section, the author is in contact with living interests, and touches on the most living issues of speculative thought at the present time. Here we come into contact with names like Boutroux, Bergson, Le Roy, and Duhem, names of living worth, and names which really live in these pages. The chapter on Pragmatism deals with such names as Pierce, James, Schiller, and Dewey, the foremost protagonists of Pragmatism; full justice is done to them, and the criticism of Pragmatism is virile and convincing. In dealing with the Philosophy of Values the chief names he deals with are those of Windelband, Münsterberg, Royce (well known in Aberdeen as a former Gifford Lecturer), and Ward, another of our Gifford Lecturers. The author is forward to acknowledge the eminence of these thinkers, and the value of their contributions to human thought, but in the interests of Realism he is constrained to dissent from their conclusions

and to criticise their methods. For it is a first principle with him that each individual has an existence and a meaning of his own, and that he is not merely a something in the consciousness of another. He insists, as much as Alice in Wonderland does, that each one is real, and not merely a thing in the Red King's dream. He cannot accept any view which would make an individual to be an item in the dream of another individual. Speaking of the view of Royce, he asks, 'Is the existence of other EGOS dependent upon me? Assuredly not! Then if I think this existence may or may not be an external meaning with respect to my idea, are my friends, and those who are dearest to me, real only in so far as they satisfy my desire? or do they rather exist in themselves in the intimacy of their consciousness, an intimacy which I cannot directly penetrate? Does *this existence of theirs in themselves* differ from my thought which takes it as its object or not? The idealist, finding himself in such a strait, takes refuge in the Universal Mind, a subterfuge which avails him nothing, since, even if the immanence in God of my thought and of the other consciousness thought by me be granted, my thought will still remain something distinct from the person I think. For instance, I conceive the reality of the individual named Royce, and even supposing my concept, and the consciousness of Royce to form part of one and the same spiritual life, my idea with its internal meaning on the one hand, and the subject Royce on the other, will nevertheless remain two distinct things which cannot be fused into one unless the consciousness of the great American philosophic be annihilated.'

Passing to the second part, which is called The New Theories of Mathematics and Physics, we find chapters on Non-Euclidean Geometry, on the New Logical Elaboration of Pure Mathematics, on Energetics, the New Qualitative Physics, and on the Theory of Models. We have read it with interest, and we think that the presentation of the views is fair and accurate, and we also think that the criticism of them is cogent and convincing. Perhaps the best thing for our purpose is to give the following extract as the outcome of this part of the treatise. It is valuable in many ways, but chiefly because it enables one to see how idealistic Realism may be. 'The scientific concept is something more than a mere summary of perceptions: it is not an *abridged experience*, but an *idealized experience*, and its fruitfulness lies in its ideal

character. In respect to experience it is not an impoverishment but a raising of it to a higher power; it is experience purified and carried to its ideal limit in order that it may satisfy the demands of necessity and logical universality. All the truly rational laws and concepts of science possess this character of ideal limits, which experience can approach more and more closely in proportion as the required conditions are verified, but which neither are nor ever can be completely realized. Every scientific concept is therefore in itself an anticipation of the future: the stamp of universality imprinted on it by thought impels it to transcend past experience and foresee the future. Our thought does not rest content with merely making a more or less economical record of perceptions, but seeks its own ideal nature in these perceptions, creating concepts which correspond more and more nearly to that type of unity which is its supreme law. There is no danger of its becoming stationary or sterile, since, as we have already seen, the ideal of reason is never realized: hence the ceaseless effort of science to harmonize known laws in higher syntheses and to establish its sway more firmly over the future. The formulas of our scientific theories, although suggested by experience, always transcend it; they are not only the reflexion of the known, but also an effort to divine the unknown. Even in the most abstract theories this hypothetic element, the life of science and the fertile root of its progressive development, is never lacking. It matters little whether the hypothesis takes concrete form in images or is expressed in mathematical signs; in either case it is a system of concepts, and only excess nominalism can stop short at the external model, and attribute to it that productiveness which is rather to be found in the thought of him who constructs it and in the idea it expresses.' The quotation is long, but we felt that we could not shorten it, because it sets forth the part which, for this realist, thought plays in the scientific construction of experience. It has here a great practice, but in all its activity thought is shown to be controlled by reality.

This appears more fully in the concluding chapter, which is called Outlines of a Spiritual Conception of the World. We may not attempt to summarize what is, indeed, too condensed already to secure a more detailed exposition. It is most suggestive, and very profound, but each section of it demands more space, to do it justice, than we

can afford to give to the whole. Special attention may be called to the section on the Dialectical Dedication of the Categories, which he thinks to be illegitimate and impossible. We follow his exposition and criticism with satisfaction, but in the end, where he deals with questions which may be called

theological, we hesitate and decline to follow without further reflexion. But with regard to the treatise as a whole, its competency, its accuracy, its incisiveness, and its fruitful suggestiveness make it a book which no student can afford to neglect.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

'He liked me.'

BY THE REV. J. S. MAVER, M.A., PAISLEY.

'Among the sons of my father he liked me, to make me king over all Israel.'—1 Ch 28⁴.

THIS is a homely phrase used only this once in our Bible. David, who never forgot his early days, and all through his life turned back specially to them on solemn and important occasions, tells in this passage how he was chosen to be king over Israel. Samuel had gone to his father's house, and there seven sons had passed before him, but not one of them was the chosen one. There remained the youngest, but it had not been thought worth while to call him from the fields, and yet when he was sent for it was found that he was the Lord's anointed. In some ways it is a misfortune to be the youngest. The rest of the family are long in believing that his judgment can be trusted, or his opinion worth considering. Who would have dreamed, the brothers would say, that our David would be chosen? And so David puts it in this simple and homely way, 'He liked me,' as he looks back to that day which meant so much for him.

It is a way of speaking we often use in common, familiar talk. I heard the remark made about a boy one day some years ago. He was the eldest among his brothers and sisters, and he had been sympathizing with a little sister who had fallen and got slightly hurt. He spoke in such a kindly way to her that one who observed it remarked afterwards, 'I like that boy.' I am sorry to say that, later on, when he became a medical student, he got into a bad set, began to think some foolish ways were manly, and brought grief to the heart of

his parents. But I believe that he will grow out of that, and that his native good disposition will yet come to the front. David too did some grievous things, but the likeable came to the top at last, and he became a great and good man in his later years, with a ripe and mellowed character.

What was it about David that God liked? (1) In the first place, I think we might say that there was something attractive about his outward appearance. Like Saul before him, David's appearance was one that would be likely to win for him the homage of the people as their king. Even though Samuel said, 'Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart,' David was certainly not lacking in appearance. We are told of him that he was 'ruddy and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to.' That description suggests an attractive face and form, and no doubt it had its share in God's choice of him for the high position in which dignity and attractiveness of appearance would all the more readily, as in 'Saul's case, gain the respect and affection of the people.'

We judge a good deal by outward appearance, though often enough what is within may not correspond. 'Look at this little chin of mine with the dimple in it,' says the heroine in a modern story. 'Though I had a knowledge of all things under the sun, and the wisdom to use it, and the deep loving heart of an angel, it would not steady me through life like this little chin.' Dimples may be more than dowries. And yet, after all, how little it is in the long companionship of life! In the long run we, too, look not on the outward appearance, but on the heart.

Oh sunset of the withered cheek
And of the careworn brow,
Oh sunset of the steadfast heart,
How beautiful art thou!

Frances Willard was distressed when a girl at school because she was not better looking. Her mother tried to comfort her by quoting to her, 'The mind hath features as the body hath.' Her father would say, 'Handsome is that handsome does'; and her brother said, 'Never mind, Frank, if you aren't the handsomest girl in the school, I hear them say you are the smartest.' She took for her motto Socrates' prayer, 'Make me beautiful within.' And beautiful without, it might be said, she came to be also. As the years passed, her good heart showed itself more and more in her face. And when, at fifty years of age, she wrote the story of her life, she called it 'My happy half-century.'

(2) But, above all, it was the inward that God looked to in David. There was something in him, 'some good thing,' something promising, that led God to choose him to be king over Israel. Children are said to be good judges of character, to know those who really love them as compared with those who merely put on and pretend. There may be some truth in that, yet children often make great mistakes and fail to appreciate what is worthy of respect.

There are not many sayings of children in the Bible, and one of the few is a very unpleasant one, where we read of the children mocking Elisha, and crying, 'Go up, thou bald head!' It is the only thing we know of Elisha's appearance. He was different from Elijah, who is referred to as 'an hairy man.' Children would stand in awe of Elijah because of his appearance. Baldness was not common among the Jews, and was looked on as a kind of disgrace. No one who was bald was allowed to be a priest. If that were a rule in the modern ministry, a big number would be excluded. You may have heard of the foreigner who was addressing the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, and who began by saying that as he looked around he was struck by the number of *barren* heads before him.

But how did the case stand with Elisha? He was held in high esteem by those who knew his character. Elijah regarded him as the one best fitted to carry on his work. The sons of the prophets accepted him as the true successor of Elijah. And on his death-bed at last, the king said of him, 'My father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!' Yet these children had no conception of the greatness and goodness of the

man, but were simply amused by his appearance. There was one little girl, however, who would not have joined with this crowd—the little maid who waited on Naaman's wife. May you all be wise enough to respect character and worth in whatsoever outward guise they may appear. And by and by, when you grow up, may you yourselves have a character and worth such as shall gain the respect of those who come after you.

(3) Lastly, note the difference between liking and loving. There is a distinction. In that great verse in St. John's Gospel, beginning—'God so loved the world,' we could hardly alter it and read, God so liked the world. To like means that there is something attractive, something likeable. God's love is for us even when there is no beauty in us, but God's liking means something fine, something of promise, in the character. George MacDonald has said, 'To be trusted is a greater compliment than to be loved.' Even the most worthless human being may yet have some one who loves him. If his mother is alive, that is likely true. She loves him even though she may have learned from sad experience that she cannot trust him. She loves him when it could hardly be said that she likes him.

A good deal has been written about friendship, from Cicero downwards, but perhaps the question, Who is my best friend? was never more happily answered than by the boy who wrote, in a school examination, 'My best friend is one who knows me and yet likes me.' Jesus loves you, and He wishes to like you as well. His love will never fail, but may there be something, too, about you, and more and more as life goes on, that He likes, even as God liked David. And there is no saying what you also may yet be called to, and chosen for, in the Providence of God.

II.

May.

'This month shall be unto you the beginning of months.'
—Ex 12².

The first of May—May-day! I wonder if you boys and girls like the sound of that word 'May-day' as well as some of us older people do.

We like it because the May-days of long ago seem very beautiful to us now. I remember one specially, as it was spent by a quaint little girl of seven years old. She had rather a dull home. Her father was a very strict man, and her mother

never thought of playing with her little boy and girl. But Louie woke very, very happy on May-day morning. ‘Lou-ie, Lou-ie!’ she heard her mother calling, ‘it is six o’clock; rise and wash your face with the May dew.’ Louie jumped out of bed very willingly indeed, for she remembered—how could she forget it?—she had been chosen to be the May Queen. Her crown of sweet spring flowers was ready. It lay covered up on the top of a chest of drawers in her room. She was a clever little girl, and had learnt quite a number of pieces of poetry. You will scarcely believe it, but as she dressed herself she kept reciting in a childish voice :

‘You have waked and called me early, called me early, mother dear ;
This is *the* most lovely day of all the glad new year ;
Of all the glad new year, mother, the maddest, merriest
day ;
For I’m to be queen o’ the May, mother, I’m to be
queen o’ the May.’

As soon as she was dressed, she trotted out to the garden, and gathering the dew from the grass, wiped her face all over with it. ‘Heckie!’ she asked softly, for her wee brother had followed her, ‘is my face beautiful?’ ‘Yes, Louie; yes, it’s like—it’s like one of the little angels in father’s big, big Bible.’ Later, dressed in a simple white frock, and wearing a crown of spring flowers, she walked in front of a long procession of school children. Her king was a little fellow whose first name was ‘Phelim,’ and her maids were girls very much bigger than herself. They kept saying, ‘Walk faster, walk faster’; but Louie was too happy to mind; for although ‘Phelim’ did not speak to her, he wore a crown like a real king’s crown, and it was made of golden lilies. The walk ended in marching round part of a fine old garden, curtseying as they passed an old lady—the gentle duchess who owned the place—and then viewing a collection of work that was ready to be sent to a missionary somewhere.

‘Mother, I was very, very happy,’ Louie said afterwards (little girls did not use the word “awfully” then); ‘I won’t dirty my dresses any more.’

The few of those children who are alive now, are elderly men and women. Just about a year ago, I had a letter from the little May Queen. ‘I can almost smell the flowers,’ she wrote, ‘the flowers that formed our crown on that May morning, long, long ago.’

My boys and girls, the May dew, and the spring flowers are still here. In Edinburgh, as early as six o’clock on the first of May, one can see numbers of young people toiling up ‘Arthur’s Seat’ to wash their faces with dew from its grassy slopes, or its summit.

The idea that the fresh dew of a May morning can make our faces beautiful is an old-fashioned one. But some of us like it. It makes us think backward. Better still, our thoughts go forward too—away to the beauty that is spoken of in the Bible, the beauty that comes from being in God’s presence. A long procession of boys and girls with faces shining from having pure and good hearts, passes before our eyes, shedding happiness on its way. I once heard an American lady professor say that she had often got an uplift from hearing of her old pupils. ‘The girls generally marry,’ she said; ‘they settle perhaps in a little country place at first; then move on to something bigger. I have sometimes followed on their trail,’ she added, ‘and all the way felt as if some one who was good had been there before me.’

The little girls present, I feel sure, want me to say something about beautiful faces. The Bible is full of stories about beautiful people. They had the beauty that comes from doing kind actions, from being true, from having noble thoughts. A little girl was one day reading the Bible, and she came upon some verses that spoke of heaven. ‘Grandpa,’ she said, ‘my Bible says that those who are in heaven shall never hunger or thirst. I understand that; but it says that “*His name shall be in their foreheads.*” What does that mean, grandpa? Who will write the name of Jesus on their foreheads?’

‘Why they will write it themselves, of course, girlie.’

‘Write it *themselves*, grandpa! but how?’

‘Why, Margery, we are every day writing the names of our masters on our foreheads. Some people make a sad mistake and serve sin, and sin stamps its seal upon their faces. Some serve care, and care brands their foreheads with deep wrinkles. But those who love the Lord Jesus, Margery, and walk with Him, and do His will, write the name of their dear Master on their foreheads. They cannot help it.’

And Margery looked up wonderingly into her grandfather’s face. She glanced at the grey hair that like a crown of glory circled the old man’s

brow. She noticed more than that: she looked into his eyes. He had a beautifully expressive face. Margery had solved the problem of the name in the forehead. She flung her arms round the old man's neck, and cried, 'I think I understand now, grandpa.'

That is a little American story I read the other day.

And let me tell you something else that is very interesting. An eminent London photographer wrote an article for a learned paper. In the course of it, he said that 'one of the best evidences for religion is the type of face that the religious life produces.' '*His name shall be in their foreheads.*' To the Israelites, this '*Beginning of months*' was to be the memory of a great deliverance. To you, my boys and girls, a May morning may be the same. Little Louie said to her mother that she felt she would never want to dirty her dresses any more. Getting into God's presence is like bathing your face with dew. It will give you such a feeling of happiness, that you will never want to do a mean action. You will always want to be true, and you will be constantly trying to make everybody round you as happy as you are yourself. Pray to God about this to-night.

III.

One of the difficulties of preaching children's sermons is that children are of many ages. The Rev. Alfred J. Costain, M.A., solves the difficulty by making his addresses '*Straight Talks to Boys*', whom (and his book) he calls *Men in the Making* (Kelly; 1s. 6d. net). The addresses are all short as well as straight. This is one of them.

The Call of Christ.

Have you ever heard of General Armstrong? One of the most remarkable of the many great men that America has produced. When he began his work for the negroes in Virginia, he wrote to a friend: 'If you care to sail into a good hearty battle, where there is no scratching and pin-sticking, but great guns and heavy shot only used, come here. If you care to lend a hand where a good cause is shorthanded, come here.'

There you have the call to the heroic that is in us, and in all ages, this is not only the call of Armstrong or of Garibaldi—it is the call of Christ.

There are plenty of people in the world who are on the look out for a 'soft job.' They rarely seem

able to get one, but it is their aim. But I fancy in most of us there is, deep down in our hearts, a conviction that that is not what we were put here in the world for. There aren't over many heroes in the world, but there's the making of a hero in most of us. Some great crisis or danger arises, and the most unlikely men leap into the fray. The call reaches them; it finds an echo in their hearts; they find themselves in the hour of need. What a chance the war has meant to many! How many who were missing their way in life have found their way to 'the front.'

War—with all its horrors—breeds heroes. It makes men. And I want you to hear the call to battle. What is wanted, said the philosopher of our day, is 'a moral equivalent for war.' Well, we have it. There is an eternal war, a holy war. The strong Son of God is ever leading forth the host of those who are ready to do battle with evil the world over. He offers 'hunger, thirst, forced marches, death'; but He also offers a prize, and it is manhood. You will win your soul. You will find yourself.

Fight the good fight with all thy might;
Christ is thy Strength, and Christ thy Right:
Lay hold on life, and it shall be
Thy joy and crown eternally.

Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages.

BY THE REV. W. ARTHUR CORNABY, WUSUEH, CHINA.

IV.

PATRIARCHAL CHILDHOOD.—Continuing our study of China's ancient religion, we find that from the beginning of the Chou dynasty (1122 B.C.), when the prestige of the various duchies or marquisates (known as the *Divided Realms*) soon began to eclipse that of the royal domain (situate in the centre, and thus called *Central Realm*), the sacrificial worship of Shang Ti ('Sovereign Above' or Most-High God) became the exclusive prerogative of the sovereign, in his Divinely ordained capacity of 'Son of Heaven.' So much so, indeed, that when the newly appointed marquis of the western state of Ch'in,¹ after the removal of the capital from

¹ It is from the name of this ancient State that we have gained the word 'China,' by a process similar to that by which we have called the land of the Hebrews 'Palestine'—

that region to Ch'ang-an (the modern Si-an in Shensi), 'offered sacrifice to Shang Ti on the (old) altar,' in the year 770 B.C., the act was severely ensured. China's great historian, Ssu-ma Ch'ienc (b. cir. 145 B.C.), says:

'The chieftain of Ch'in had only lately been recognized as a marquis, and for him to worship Shang Ti was manifest arrogance. Such worship belonged only to the Son of Heaven; it was the secondary - sacrificial worship of (the spirits of) notable hills and rivers that pertained to the various (dukes and) marquises. The act of the chieftain of Ch'in was barbarous. It was a violent crime. It was the primary spoliation of goodness and right for after generations.'

Again, in the year 253 B.C., when 'the prince of Ch'in presented himself before Shang Ti at Yung' (in modern Shensi), another historian says that the act was one of 'most flagrant arrogance.'

From a wider point of view we might have imagined the censure to have fallen rather on the sovereign for claiming a monopoly of such worship. For, although the earliest sacrificial worship of the Most High that is recorded in the Chinese Annals is represented as a regal act, the ancient 'sovereigns' prior to 2205 B.C., are regarded by the best modern Chinese writers as chieftains rather than 'sovereigns.' Moreover, nearly all the actual worshippers of Shang Ti mentioned (with favourable reference) in the old classics edited by Confucius, were certainly local chieftains, not 'sovereigns'—although one of them became such afterwards by force of arms.

We have only to go back in imagination, then, to the time—clearly indicated by the patriarchal character of Chinese imperial government—when the Chinese were a pastoral race (as their written characters represent them to have been¹⁾) under actual patriarchs, to find such patriarchs normally it being the westernmost part of the land, as Philistia was of Canaan.

The Hebrews quoted it as *Sinim*, the Greeks as *Thina* and *Sina* (the first explicit notice of Thina is by Eratosthenes, b. 276 B.C.), from which our modern word *China* came to us through the Portuguese. After its long Western wanderings, the word has at last been re-introduced into the Chinese language by Japanese writers as *Chih-na*, and adopted in Chinese journalism as 'the Western name for our Central Realm.'

¹⁾ Righteousness is formed of the signs *my* and *sheep*, i.e. recognition of my property. Officials (in old time) were written down as *pastors*, from *ox* and *striker*. Etc. etc.

regarded as sacrificial worshippers of Shang Ti, each on behalf of his clan or family.

This consideration brings us into touch with the priesthood of Jethro and Job (1⁵), as well as that of Melchizedek. It helps to explain also the coveted 'birthright' of the eldest son in the generations immediately following Abraham. That 'birthright' was 'profanely' rejected (Heb 11¹⁶) by Esau; and when given to Joseph (1 Ch 5², 'the birthright was Joseph's') its outward and visible sign was 'a long robe with sleeves' (Gn 37³, R.V. marg.), as any priestly dress would require to have been in China.

Among the Hebrews, for the ceremonial preservation of the worship of God, this patriarchal priesthood was merged awhile in the more rigid office of the Levitical priesthood, with various safeguards against a monopoly of the general privilege of worship; it reappeared (from the prophetic point of view) as the office of the nation as a whole (Is 61⁶); it was eventually rejected by the nation (Ro 9-10), but ideally invested in Christ, with Himself as oblation (Heb 1-10), and more generally in those 'loosed from their sins by his blood' (Rev 1⁵⁻⁶).

It is a striking fact that the patriarchal priesthood of the rulers of China (whether Chinese, Mongol, or Manchu), which can be traced back beyond the days of Melchizedek, was not discontinued until 1911,² by which time the Cross had been accepted (and adopted in the form of the 'red cross') throughout the Far East as the symbol of infinite benevolence; the priesthood of Christ proclaimed, and prayers and intercessions offered to Shang Ti by Christians in every large city in China. Indeed, in April 1913, those Christians in every city were officially requested by the Cabinet to fill the void left by the discontinuance of imperial intercession, by their united intercessions with Shang Ti for the nation at large—such being the inner explanation of a non-Christian government's appeal for Christian prayer.

WORSHIP.—Our modern word *worship*, so commonly used in the sense 'to adore as divine,' has intrinsically (like some Hebrew and Greek words which it represents in the Scriptures) a wide range of meaning. It is represented by twenty-five

²⁾ The last imperial sacrifice with intercessory prayer to Shang Ti was offered at the 'Altar of Heaven' in Peking at the autumn equinox of 1911, prior to the Revolution.

words in the current literary language of China, twenty-one of which are of sacrificial significance, two others meaning simple prayer, and the remaining two (*a*) 'respect' or 'reverence' and (*b*) 'an act or attitude of respect or reverence.'

1. *Religious Worship*.—To the question of Micah: 'Wherewith shall I . . . bow myself before the high God?' the answer in ancient China was very like the words: 'With . . . offerings, with calves of a year old.' A young ox was essential to the ceremony. And for the lesser worship of hill and river spirits by subordinate rulers (after the regal monopoly of the highest worship) a sheep was necessary for the occasion. All statedly religious worship, whether of a higher or lower order, was accompanied by the offering of sacrificial victims.

The meaning of these was 'propitiatory,' in the broad sense of the word, as gifts might be when offered to rulers or local governors (cf. Mal 1⁸) whose favour and aid was desired.

Any 'worship' whatever in which there was no sacrificial offering ceased to be a religious act, and the object of such 'worship' was regarded as void of superhuman sacredness. This point of view is set forth in the following narrative, taken from two historical works of the Han dynasty, from which the shorter Annals were compiled:

'In the reign of *Han Wu Ti* (140-87 B.C., more than 150 years before the commonly-quoted "first introduction of Buddhism into China") a large army was sent into Mid Asia to conquer certain "barbarian" realms from which no tribute had been received. The two kings of those regions agreed to submit. But one of them, *Hsiu-t'o* by name, repenting of his decision, was slain by the other, who brought the treasures of both realms, as propitiatory offerings, to the *Han* general.'

'From the realm of *Hsiu-t'o* was brought a golden image of Buddha, more than ten feet in height; and with it as hostages the son of the slain king and his retinue. The young "barbarian" prince was of majestic bearing; he gained the grace of the emperor, who appointed him equerry-in-chief. In spite of the remonstrances of his statesmen, the emperor caused the golden image to be honourably set up in the palace, and installed the young prince as instructor in its worship. Thereupon the statesman remonstrated again, saying: "The

attendants of the golden man do not use oxen or sheep in sacrifice, but merely burn incense, ceremonially bowing (before it)." But the emperor would not listen to them. And thus Buddhism began to be introduced into China.'

Since the year 1900, Chinese Buddhist and Taoist temples have, in increasing numbers, been turned into public schools (and the idols cleared out and destroyed), for the avowed reason that those two cults have ceased to have any religious significance, being simply a means of gain to the ill-famed monks and nuns in charge,¹ and of supposed gain (of a strictly material order) to their votaries—many of whom will now, from the progress of education itself, be able actually to secure the precise gains which they once vainly sought by the offering of incense in the discarded temples.

In like manner, we may note that the worship of God Himself had, among a section of Hebrew worshippers, 'ceased to have any religious significance' in the times represented by such passages as Jer 44¹⁸ and Mal 3¹⁴.

2. *Non-religious Worship*.—To a modern Western reader, the narrative of Abraham's reception of the 'three men' (who are called 'the Lord' and 'two angels' Gn 18-19¹⁻¹⁵) seems to suggest that, from the first, he recognized his visitors to be more than human. An Asiatic would not read it thus. For, in reality, the 'bowing down to the earth' and the epithet 'lord' had as little religious significance as similar actions and words have had in China, when addressed to the writer, for instance, by humble non-Christian visitors at New Year's time, or by beggars at the roadside generally. With various polite essentials of Oriental guest-receiving, preserved in China until recent years (such as *chieh*, 'going forth to greet,' and *sung*, 'convoying on the way,' and depreciating words concerning available refreshment), Abraham 'shewed much worship' to his visitors, in the old English sense of the phrase, as used in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*.

In like manner Joseph's brethren worshipped the (then) unknown governor of Egypt, and doubtless Jacob worshipped Pharaoh,² although the

¹ In the Chinese language no such phrase as Buddhist or Taoist *priest* occurs.

² Adding a singularly Oriental depreciation of his 'honourable age.' Over against 'few and evil have been the days of the years of my life,' a quantitative depreciation, there is the common Chinese qualitative depreciation: '(I have) emptily passed seventy' or 'eighty years.'

word is not mentioned, as it is in Is 49⁷ and Dn 2⁴⁶.

In the last passage (an exceedingly interesting one) we should say in Chinese that Nebuchadnezzar ‘worshipped Daniel as Prime Minister.’ And in that fact, and a Chinese incident about to be related, we gain much light upon the third temptation of our Lord (the third according to St. Matthew), which to modern Western minds seems to contain the utterly impossible meaning that Jesus should yield divine honours to the devil!

‘During the “Divided Realms” period of the Chou dynasty, when the dukes and marquises of the various States were mostly independent of the central authority (of the literally “central realm”), and were becoming kings in all but name, the young Duke Huan of the northern State of Ch’i, in the year 684 B.C., sought for a wise man as counsellor. One Kuan I-wu had been opposed to him, and was regarded as his enemy. But was possessed of such diplomatic skill and experience that, yielding to persuasion, the young Duke Huan, finding no other so suitable, “accord-

ingly worshipped him as prime minister,” and adopting his methods, became great in the land.’

Thus illustrated, the third temptation was a truly insidious one. It was not that Jesus should yield up one iota of His divine status, or of His divine commission. It may have been simply that He should adopt, in His sacred enterprise, methods which had proved fitting and successful in the non-sacred establishment of earthly realms: methods which, though ordinarily connected with satanic evil, might, under the sacred mastery of the Christ of God, be overruled for the best ultimate good.

It was such a temptation as this against which our Lord was proof, if His representatives on earth have not always been so. He was to win the human multitude without the isolation of unworldliness, waiving some of the strict demands of the spiritual, avoiding the lowliness of toilsome ministry, the risk of rejection, the tragic horrors of a seeming defeat. It was this temptation He hurled behind Him, choosing rather to suffer the ‘sharpness of death,’ and thus to ‘open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.’

John Mark.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. S. J. CASE, PH.D., CHICAGO.

MARK is not a conspicuous figure in the extant records of the Apostolic Age. Apart from the title of the Gospel which bears his name, he is mentioned only ten times in the New Testament. In five instances he is called ‘Mark’ (*Márkos* [WH], but more correctly *Máρκος* [Ac 15³⁹, Col 4¹⁰, Philem 24, 2 Ti 4¹¹, 1 P 5¹³]); three times he is referred to as ‘John whose surname was (or, who was called) Mark’ (*Ιωάνου τοῦ ἐπικαλούμενον Μάρκου* [Ac 12¹²] ; *Ιωάνη τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον* [Ac 12²⁵] ; *Ιωάνην τὸν καλούμενον Μάρκον* [Ac 15³⁷]); and on two occasions he is called simply ‘John’ (*Ιωάννην* [Ac 13⁵] ; *Ιωάνης* [Ac 13¹²]). ‘John’ is a Jewish name, and ‘Mark’ (Marcus) is a Latin *praenomen* assumed in accordance with a custom familiar at that time. Similarly, Saul of Tarsus assumed the *cognomen* ‘Paulus’ (Ac 13⁹; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 181–

186; Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 313–317).

The New Testament statements about Mark are very brief. He is said to be the son of a certain Mary at whose house in Jerusalem Christians were assembled when Peter escaped from the prison into which he had been thrown by Herod Agrippa I. (Ac 12^{12ff.}). Evidently this house was a familiar place of meeting, for Peter went directly there and the maid who tended the door immediately recognized his voice. Presumably Mark was at home during these days, and so found himself in association with early representatives of the new religious movement. He is next mentioned in connexion with the return of Barnabas and Saul after they had carried relief to Judea (Ac 12²⁵). Probably Mark remained with them in Antioch, whence he accompanied them on the so-called first missionary

journey. He is said to have been with them at Salamis serving as their 'attendant' (*ὑπηρέτης* [Ac 13⁵]), but at Perga he abandoned the expedition and returned to Jerusalem (Ac 13¹³). Nothing more is heard of him until Paul proposes a second missionary tour. In the meantime Mark has apparently come back to Antioch, and Barnabas wishes to take him along a second time. Paul's vigorous protest results in a split with Barnabas, who sets out with Mark, while Paul and Silas journey together (Ac 15³⁷⁻⁴¹). Mark's name does not appear again in Acts, but in the letter to Philemon (v. 24) he is included among those 'fellow-workers' (*συνεργοί*) who are helping Paul in the task of evangelization during his imprisonment. Also in Col 4¹⁰, of the two fellow-workers left to comfort Paul in his affliction, Mark is one. He is here said to be the cousin (*ἀνεψιός*) of Barnabas, and is commended to the Colossians as worthy of a cordial reception should he make a journey thither. In 2 Ti 4¹¹ Mark is no longer with Paul at Rome, but is somewhere in the East. Timothy is urged to come to Rome as quickly as possible, bringing along Mark, who is useful to Paul for ministering (*εἰς διακονίαν*). Finally, Mark is in 'Babylon' (*ἐν Βαβυλῶνι*), where he unites with Peter, who calls him his son (*νιός*), in salutations to the readers of the Epistle (1 P 5¹³). In addition to these explicit statements, it has been conjectured that he was the water-carrier mentioned in Mk 14¹³ (Lk 22¹⁰), or that he was the young man who fled so hastily on the night of Jesus' arrest (Mk 14^{51f.}; see Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipzig, 1900², ii. p. 212, n. 6; Eng. tr., *Introduction to the New Testament*, New York, 1909, ii. p. 446, n. 6). But these conjectures do not rise above the level of interesting possibilities. Much less can Hitzig's contention that John Mark is the John of Patmos who composed Rev. be taken seriously (Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften*, Zürich, 1843; cf. Spitta, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Halle, 1889, who posits Markan authorship for one of the sources of Rev.).

Only a very meagre outline of Mark's career can be reconstructed from these New Testament data. He first appears upon the scene about the year 44 A.D. At that time he was living with his mother in Jerusalem, where he came into contact with representatives of the new religious movement. At some unknown date he espoused this cause later associating himself with Barnabas and Saul at

Antioch and in their travels through Cyprus to Perga in Pamphylia. There he left them and returned home to Jerusalem, but later came again to Antioch. He would have gone with them upon a second trip had not Paul refused his company. Thereupon he became the travelling companion of his cousin Barnabas. Their further missionary labours are ignored by the author of Acts, but it seems highly probable that Barnabas continued to carry on aggressive evangelistic work (1 Co 9⁶). Probably Mark was similarly engaged, although no record has been made of his activities during these years. We have to content ourselves with a few hints suggesting that he was at one time with Paul in Rome, at another time in the East, and on still another occasion with Peter in 'Babylon' (*i.e.* Rome).

Several difficulties arise in any effort to interpret these scanty data. (1) When Barnabas and Saul were preaching in the Jewish synagogues of Salamis in Cyprus, Mark is said to have been their attendant (Ac 13⁵). But 'attendant' (*ὑπηρέτης*) is a term having various possible meanings. In the present connexion it is commonly taken to imply that Mark, while not serving as a menial (*δοῦλος*), was nevertheless mainly busied with minor duties in connexion with the journey—'arrangements for travel, the provision of food and lodging, conveying messages, negotiating interviews, and the like (Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1902,² p. xvi). He was not engaged in the actual work of preaching, but in rendering personal service to Barnabas and Saul. Others suggest that it fell to Mark to baptize the converts (e.g. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 146). Still others take 'attendant' as an official title (as in Lk 4²⁰) used to designate an individual whose duty it was to perform stated services in the synagogue. Once upon a time, so it is assumed, Mark had occupied this office, and henceforth he was known as 'John the synagogue attendant' (so F. H. Chase, article 'Mark (John)', Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii., Edinburgh, 1909, p. 245 f., reading *εἶχον* as equivalent to *εἶχον μεθ' ἐαυτῶν*). If a choice is to be made from among these conjectures, it is perhaps safer to follow the hint given in 2 Ti 4¹¹, to the effect that Mark is useful for ministering (*εὐχρηστός εἰς διακονίαν*), and so to find in Acts a reference to Mark's general usefulness in connexion with the mission. Thus his rôle, in the eyes of the writer of Acts, is similar to that of Timothy, Titus, and

other helpers mentioned only incidentally in the New Testament.

(2) Whether Mark was so fully responsible for the breach between Paul and Barnabas, as the brief statement of Ac 15^{38f.} might imply, is also a question. One class of interpreters endeavours to justify Mark's abandonment of the first expedition on the grounds of expediency. He had not, it is said, been designated by the Holy Spirit for this work, he may not at the outset have known that the mission would extend to Asia, and home duties may have called him back to Jerusalem (see W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1893, p. 61; Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 246). But may not the events recorded by Paul in Gal 2^{11f.} shed some light on Mark's situation? According to this representation it was not the conduct of Mark, but that of Peter, which led to the break with Barnabas (Gal 2¹³). The two incidents need not be mutually exclusive, but in any case the events at Antioch described in Gal. were in all probability earlier than those mentioned in Ac 15^{38f.} and the former incidents must have been an important preliminary to the latter. In Acts, Mark has been made—whether by design or by accident can only be conjectured—to bear the brunt of a burden which Paul is disposed to place chiefly upon Peter. It is not impossible, to be sure, that Mark was among 'the rest of the Jews' whose dissimulation helped to lead astray 'even Barnabas'; but Peter more immediately, and James ultimately, were, in Paul's judgment, chiefly responsible for this unfortunate turn of affairs (Gal 2^{11f.}). At most, Barnabas' desire to take Mark upon the second journey was the climax, and not the primary cause, of his break with Paul.

(3) Later mention of Mark as one of Paul's most trusty helpers constitutes still another difficulty. It is a very sudden and harsh transition from the point where Mark is last mentioned in Acts (15³⁹), as being so objectionable to Paul, to the passage in Philemon (v.²⁴), where Mark's name is given first place among Paul's fellow-workers. The difficulty is only enhanced by the further statements in Col 4^{10f.} and 2 Ti 4¹¹, where it appears that Paul values Mark perhaps above any other of his companions, unless an exception be made in the case of Luke 'the beloved physician.' How did it come about that one who had been so distinctly *persona non grata* to Paul in earlier times could subsequently become his loyal supporter? There had been, of

course, ample time for differences to be healed; but in view of what has been said above the breach between Mark and Paul may not even at the outset have been so wide as the brief statement in Ac 15^{37ff.} standing alone might seem to imply. One thing at least is certain, Mark ultimately became one of Paul's most valued helpers. This fact is sufficiently attested by Philem ²⁴, quite apart from any possible question about the authorship of Col. or 2 Timothy.

(4) This certainty regarding the friendship between Mark and Paul raises the problem of Mark's relations with Peter. Their acquaintance had doubtless begun in Jerusalem, but they are not found together again until we come to 1 P 5¹³. Here Mark appears in filial association with Peter; and one wonders how his attachment could have been so close to both Paul and Peter, since these two individuals are commonly thought to represent rival tendencies within early Christianity. Among the different solutions proposed for this problem, the hypothesis of two Marks in the Apostolic Age is now quite generally rejected (see Schanz, *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Marcus*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 2. n. 1). The Tübingen School, which stresses the differences between Paul and Peter, doubts the genuineness of 1 P., making it the work of a tendency writer who for synthetic purposes transferred prominent companions of Paul, like Silvanus and Mark, into the company of Peter. Other interpreters make the gap between Paul and Peter less wide, so that the problem of adjustment becomes mainly a chronological and a geographical one. 'Babylon' is now generally taken to be a metaphorical expression for Rome, and as Mark was certainly there with Paul, so he may have rendered Peter similar service when that apostle visited the city. This whole question is bound up with other problems, such as the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Peter, his residence in Rome, and the dates at which he and Paul died. Since the discussion of these questions does not fall within the scope of the present article, we may simply note that Mark's association with Paul is much more strongly attested, so far as New Testament data go, than is his association with Peter.

In view of the scantiness and obscurity of the New Testament records, it is not surprising that early Christian tradition should have endeavoured to supply additional information about Mark. This interest was greatly stimulated by the fact that

the early Church was using a Gospel which, by common consent from an early date, was said to have been written by him. Even in the time of Papias this seems to have been a generally accepted opinion (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). Accordingly lacunæ in the New Testament records were soon filled out with data regarding this evangelist's family connexions and personal characteristics, his association with Jesus and the apostles, his own activity, and the manner of his death. These traditions are rarely trustworthy, but they are of interest in showing the efforts of early Christians to enlarge upon the history of apostolic times. (1) The Vulgate preface to Mk., frequently referred to as the Monarchian Prologue, states that Mark had cut off his thumb to avoid the necessity of serving as a priest (see Wordsworth and White, *Nouum Testamentum Latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi*, ii. [Euangelium secundum Marcum], Oxford, 1891, p. 171; and Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien* [Texte und Untersuchungen, xv.], Leipzig, 1896, p. 9f.); and in Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vii. 30 [Eng. tr., *Refut.* vii. 18]) he is called the 'stub-fingered' (*κολοβοδάκτυλος*). The exact meaning of Hippolytus' epithet is still in doubt, but possibly it also has reference to a supposed self-mutilation of Mark in order to avoid service as a priest. His kinship to Barnabas the Levite (Col 4¹⁰, Ac 4³⁶) doubtless furnished the incentive for such tradition.

(2) Legend also gives Mark a definite place in the history of Jesus' career. According to one interpretation of the opening words of the Muratorian canon, it affirms Mark's association with Jesus. The fragment begins in the middle of a sentence thus: 'at some, however, he was present, and so recorded them' (*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*). The writer apparently is speaking of Mark, hence 'at some' has been taken to mean on certain occasions in the ministry of Jesus. But more probably this language should be understood to mean that Mark was present on certain occasions when Peter preached and later recorded in the Gospel what he there heard. This is in agreement with the statement of Papias, that Mark 'neither heard the Lord nor did he follow him, but afterwards, as I said, (attended) Peter,' later writing down what he remembered of Peter's discourses (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* iv. 5). Several later, but wholly unreliable, authorities place Mark among the 'Seventy'

(see Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, ii. 2, Braunschweig, 1884, p. 328 f.).

(3) Tradition also enlarged upon Mark's association with the apostles, particularly with Peter. This was a natural development, considering the growing importance of the Roman Church with which Peter's name came to be so closely linked. The Monarchian Prologue says that Mark was baptized by Peter (*Petri in baptismate filius*), but this statement may be only an inference drawn from the expression 'my son' in 1 P 5¹⁸. More importance is commonly attached to the numerous statements (cited fully by Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 321 f.) which make Mark the missionary companion of Peter from whom the chief content of the Gospel of Mark is said to be derived. The earliest of these witnesses is Papias, who, on the authority of 'the Elder' (John), says: 'Mark, becoming the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, but not, however, in order, so much as he remembered of the things said and the things done by Christ' (Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). This is not the place to discuss the authorship of the Second Gospel; we are chiefly concerned with the expression 'interpreter of Peter' (*έρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου*). This language ordinarily would mean that Peter knew only the Semitic speech and that Mark served as translator when they were among Greek-speaking peoples. Papias is usually so understood, but another meaning is possible. In a previous paragraph he has spoken of his own treatise expounding the discourses of the Lord as 'interpretations' (*έρμηνειαί* [Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 39. 3]), and possibly he styled Mark 'interpreter' because the latter had embodied the substance of Peter's sermons in a written Gospel. Similarly, when Papias says that the Matthean collection of the Lord's sayings originally written in 'Hebrew' were 'interpreted' according to individual ability (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15), he may have in mind expositions such as his own 'interpretation.' Indeed, it is not at all certain—some would say quite improbable—that he had so much as seen the 'Hebrew' collection of which he speaks, and certainly his treatise was not in the nature of a translation. His meaning is at best obscure, and similar remarks in other early writings are mostly if not wholly inspired by his statements; and his information, or that of his informant, may ultimately have sprung from the New Testament representation that Peter's affiliations at the outset

were emphatically Jewish and that in later times Mark served him as a 'son.'

(4) Mark is also credited with important independent activities, especially in Egypt, where he was the first to preach Christianity and found a Church in Alexandria. Eusebius (*H.E.*, ii. 16. 1) is authority for this information, which he may have derived from a late second century list of

Alexandrian bishops. This he supplemented by his unjustified inference that the Therapeutæ, described in Philo's tractate *quod omnis probus liber*, must have been a company of Christians. Finally, in the late and wholly unhistorical Acts of Mark, the Evangelist is glorified as the first martyr of Alexandria (Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-327 and 329 ff.).

Contributions and Comments.

Revelation xvi. 16.

I SHOULD much like to draw the attention of your readers to Rev 16¹⁶, the prophecy of 'a great hail' that shall fall 'out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent'; and this in connexion with the Battle of Armageddon.

For many years I have in my own mind referred this prophecy to cannon-balls; for though these do not actually fall out of heaven, yet to persons exposed to them they may easily appear to do so. To bombs dropped from aeroplanes the description seems more appropriate. 'Ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ' is more accurately 'from the sky' than 'from heaven.'

Whether we are actually witnessing the Battle of Armageddon, we cannot say; but if that awful judgment is still reserved for some future generation, is it not highly probable that the art of aeronautics has a great development in store; and that its present exploits are but a preparation for an enormously greater fulfilment of this awful prophecy?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

Corrigenda and Addenda in 'B.D.B.'

In addition to the *Addenda et Corrigenda* printed at the end (pp. 1119-1127) of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon (conveniently known as *B.D.B.* from the names of its editors, Dr. Brown, Dr. Driver, Dr. Briggs), I have noticed the following. (As *Addenda* are often debatable points it seems well to make two separate lists, beginning with obvious *Corri-*

genda.) Some are quite trivial; others are more important; but all seem worth noting.

I.

Page. Col.

- 266. 2. Under II. Ib 19¹⁷ read לְאשָׁתִי זֹר.
- 344. 1. „ Niph. Ob⁶ read נַחֲפֵשׂ.
- 371. 2. „, תּוּבָר, for 'Ex' read 'Ez.'
- 401. 1. Line 24, for 'e (4)' read '6 c.'
- 419. 1. Under עַיִן adj., transpose עַ in first exple.
- 431. 2. Piel, for 'Impf.' read 'Pf.'
- 435. 1. Line 1, Ges. ref. read § 76 (2) f.
- 498. 1. For 'Niph.', read 'Nithpl. (or as Hithp., cf. Driver in loc.)'
- 534. 1. Line 15, Ges. ref., for 'Anm⁸' read 'ee.'
- 554. 2. Line 6, for חַנְנָה read חַנְנָה.
- 620. 1. Under נֶגֶר, 1, for מְנֻרִים (Hoph.) read חַנְפְּרִים (Niph.).
- 772. 4. Under עַנְבָּה, line 3, עַנְבָּה, note that the Bomberg edition has עַנְבָּי.
- 849. 1. Line 14, for '566' read '596.'
- 857. 2. Under צַעַר Qal-Inf. בְּצַעַר, note that Mass. Text points בְּצַעַר.
- 857. 2. Third line from end, Isa ref. read '3²¹'.
- 899. 2. Under קָרָה Qal, third line, for וַיָּקָר read וַיָּקָר.
- 903. 2. Under קָשְׁקָשָׁה, third line, note that Mas. Text reads קָשְׁקָשִׁים in passage cited.
- 908. 1. Line 23 from end, for '1 S.' read '2 S.'
- 961. 1. Under שָׁוֵי, 1, between 'field' and 12¹² insert 'ψ'; and between 'also' and 10⁴ insert 'Ho.'
- 966. 2. Under שְׁטַנָּו, third line, for לְשְׁטַנָּו read לְשְׁטַנָּו.
- 1054. 1. Line 10 from end, for the ה in first word read ח.
- 1075. 2. Line 4, for בִּיחָד read בִּיחָד.

BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

1081. 2. Under נָגַן, last line, for 'pl.' read 'du.'
1091. 1. Under יְהֹוָה, for Qr יְהֹוָה read יְהֹוָה.
1109. 2. Under אֲזַבּוּ, last word, for עַ read עַ.
1114. 1. Under שְׁכֵל, for 'Hithpe,' read 'Hithpa.'

II.

130. 2. Under בְּתִין, why not allude to the derivation proposed = *splendens*? Cf. Ges. *Thesaurus* quoted by H. P. Smith (*Samuel*, p. 106).
229. 2. Under חַלְלָה, cf. Kittel, Mi 4⁷, who proposes הַנְּחַלָּה, while 'the versions seem to have read הַנְּדַחָה, as in v. 6.'
461. 2. Under כֶּר it should be pointed out that the word is *masc.* in 1 Ki 18²⁴.
561. 1. Under מָוֵה, add the conjecture רַיִן (from רַחַה, 'emaciated') given by Driver in Kittel.
623. 2. Under נָדַר there is, curiously, no mention of the Impf. וַיָּדַר which occurs Gn 28²⁰, Num 21², Ju 11³⁰.
642. 2. Line 13 from end, add ref. to Ez 34²⁹ for שְׁמַם.
671. 2. Line 26, 1 Ch 14², the form נִשְׁאָה here taken as ptc. might also be an exceptional Pf. Indeed, E. L. Curtis, *in loc.*, says it 'must be' so taken.
674. 2. Under נִשְׁה add cross ref. to Sh, p. 1009.
704. 1. Under סְעֻפָּה. Why not link with שְׁעָפִים, p. 972? May not the two words be really one? Cf. Burney on 1 Ki 18²¹.
743. 2. Under עַיט add ref. to 1 S 25¹⁴.
866. 1. Under בְּכָה, why not give a familiar English equivalent? 'Near $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon.'

BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

1101. 2. Add ref. to verb נָגַן Hithpa. Ezr 5¹.
1115. 2. Add שְׁלַטְנָה, Dan 3^{2f}, with a ref. to BH, p. 1020.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's and Queen's Colleges, London.

Acts xxvii. 17.

THE prevailing view as to the meaning of 'undergirding' a ship is that it refers to the practice,

common in antiquity, of passing one or more cables under the hull and then fastening them tightly to prevent the timbers giving way in bad weather. This view is championed by James Smith in his well-known book *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, which is still the best authority on its subject (see pp. 107–109, 210–215 in 4th edition, 1880). Reference to the article on 'Ships and Boats' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, extra volume, and that on 'Ship' in *Encyclopædia Biblica* will show that support is still forthcoming for the alternative theory, which supposes the ropes to have been passed along the outside of the ship longitudinally. The usage of *βοηθείας* to denote the cables does not seem to have received illustration. It may be a nautical term otherwise unknown, or Harnack's idea may be right, that a medical metaphor is to be postulated (see *Luke the Physician*, p. 181). There is authority for this use; see Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 273, whom Harnack is following here, but *prima facie* it would appear perverse to see medical phraseology in so distinctively nautical a passage.

Instances showing the use of the expedient of undergirding a ship—'frapping' is the technical English word—will be found in Smith's work, the latest being from the year 1837. It does not seem to have been noticed that a similar device has on occasion been employed to stop a hole in a ship. The reference is found in the account of Captain Cook's first voyage as described in Roderick Flanagan's *History of New South Wales* (quoted in *Early Days in Australia*, edited by Herbert Strang, pp. 106, 107). The ship had sprung a serious leak, and was making for the land.

'It was impossible, however, that the labour by which the pumps were worked could be continued for any length of time, and, as the exact situation of the leak could not be ascertained, there was no hope of stopping it within.'

'While the captain was perplexed as to what course to follow in this emergency, a midshipman named Monkhouse proposed the adoption of an expedient which he had seen followed successfully under similar circumstances, in one of his voyages. The young man was entrusted with the direction of the process which was called "fothering," and was performed thus: To one side of a sail were loosely stitched handfuls of oakum and wool, chopped into fine pieces, and over this was plastered all the sheep-dung procurable on board.'

This sail so prepared was then drawn under the bottom of the ship by means of ropes. When it came under the leak, the suction carried the material that had been stitched to the sail into the aperture, which thus became partially stopped. By these means the water was so far reduced, that while three pumps were previously necessary to keep it under, it was now readily checked by one.'

The ship got safely to the shore and the damage was repaired. Is it beyond the bounds of possibility that St. Luke's unusual word *βοηθεῖας*—translated in the English versions in the only possible way, 'helps'—was suggested by the fact that some unusual method, not the ordinary process of undergirding, was employed? It should be remembered that James Smith finds the narrative of Acts inexplicable apart from the supposition that the ship had sprung a leak.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

Numbers xxii. 6.

THE words אִילָי אַוְכֵל נֶכֶה בּוֹ are usually regarded as an instance of the non-agreement of the main and auxiliary verbs in number. This non-agreement is explained by comparing Is 47¹, לְאַחֲסִיפִי, or by regarding אַוְכֵל as a scribal error for נַוְכֵל, due to the proximity and influence of אִילָי. The LXX has δυνάμεθα, i.e. וְכָל. Rashi explains אַנְיִ וְעַמִּי נֶכֶה נֶכֶה, which solves the sense but not the grammar.

I venture to think that נֶכֶה represents the infinitive construct Pi'el, and that it is directly subordinated to the auxiliary verb, without the use of ל, a construction which is too well known to require comment. It will be urged—

- (1) That the root נֶכֶה is used in the Hif'il and not in the Pi'el.
- (2) That the form נֶכֶה would be strange even for נֶכֶה the inf. abs., while, as a matter of fact,
- (3) The inf. const. (נֶכֶות) is desiderated.

But in reply to—

- (1) The Pu'al occurs in Ex 9^{31. 32}. If a Pu'al is found, a Pi'el cannot be impossible.

(2) The shortening of ְגֵרֶה to ְסֵגֶול is the result of the loss of the tone, owing to the following monosyllable בּוֹ, joined to נֶכֶה by *Maqqef*. Further, we find הַרְבָּה נֶכֶה for הַרְבָּה in virtual pause (Jer 42²).

(3) The forms of הַלְלִים infinitives vary considerably, and too much uniformity cannot be expected. But, in point of fact, Hos 6⁹ (זְכַחַפֵּבְאַלְלִים) furnishes an exact parallel for the use of the form הַלְלָה for הַלְלִים, since the change of *he* to *yod* is merely orthographical (so Gesenius, § 75aa). In the Hif'il, הַרְבָּה is used for the inf. const. in Ezk 21²⁰. Altogether הַלְלִים verbs display many varieties of form in their infinitives.

Finally, I see that Baer, in his concordance, places נֶכֶה in the Pi'el division, and that Ibn Ezra also regards it as an infinitive (שֶׁמֶת הַפָּעֵל), and for the *he* form, compares Dn 9²⁴, where his text seems to have read לְבָלְלָה for our לְכָלָל.

HERBERT LOEWE.

Exeter College, Oxford.

'House.'

I.

IN reference to Rev. Harrington C. Lees' note on 'house' in the February EXPOSITORY TIMES, I see that Davidson, in commenting on Zeph 1⁸, 'king's children,' says, 'LXX reads "house." The words "children" and "house" are occasionally confused. LXX reads "house" where Heb. has "children" in Jer 16¹⁵, Ezk 2⁸, 1 Ch 2¹⁰; on the other hand it reads "children" where Heb. has "house" in Gn 45¹¹, Ex 16³¹, Jos 17¹⁷ 18⁵, Hos 17¹¹.

G. HERBERT KING.

Croydon.

II.

In reply to Rev. Harrington C. Lees may I be allowed to say that 'house' is a generic term commonly in use in the 'unchanging East' to describe a household, an establishment of which the man is the natural head. I remember the late Sir Richard Temple telling me more than thirty years ago that in India one never asked an Indian about his wife's health, but 'How is the house?'

CH. CALLOW.

Golcar, Huddersfield.

The remaining Syriac Versions of the Gospels.

AFTER having expressed in a succinct manner our opinion about the Lewisian Version and compared it successively with the Curetonian and the Diatessaron, it may be worth while to write some lines on each of the remaining Versions separately. By order of importance and not of date we meet first with the Version called *Pshitta*. A desideratum is justly felt everywhere for a critical edition of this Version, the four editions published at Mosul that I myself revised and corrected, and the edition of Urmi and that of New York being undertaken solely for practical purposes. A good essay towards a critical edition has recently seen the light in *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum* of Pusey and Gwilliam; and in spite of grave defects this edition marks the first step towards a final study of this Version. The task of preparing a serious publication would be difficult, because its text having been used in the Syrian Church from the end of the fourth century down to our own day, hundreds of useful and ancient manuscripts would have to be constantly perused.

History is dumb as to the origin of this Version. A well-known critic¹ tried to show in the last few years that Rabbūla, Bishop of Edessa (411–435), may be assumed to have been its exclusive author. The reason for this opinion is a passage found in the life of this saint written by a Monophysite, in which it is said that Rabbūla translated the New Testament from Greek into Syriac. This passage runs thus :

‘And he translated by the wisdom of God which was in him, the New Testament, from Greek into Syriac, because of its variants, with accuracy, as it was.’²

Strictly speaking, we can draw no logical argument from this passage in favour of the *Pshitta* or of any other Version known to-day. The only point that we can hold with safety is that Rabbūla is credited by a Monophysite writer, some thirty to fifty years after his death, with a translation of the New Testament. The canons for priests and monks that Rabbūla himself had compiled, at the end of his life, contain nothing for the corrobor-

ation of his claim to being a Scriptural author: ‘Let priests and deacons take care that in all churches a gospel of the separated (texts) should be found and read.’³ This passage has clearly the condemnation of the Diatessaron in view, and cannot present any suggestion of a Version edited by Rabbūla.

About the first of these two passages we can even advance another step. A constant Syrian tradition represented by historians such as ‘Amer ibn Matta⁴ and Ebedjesu of Nisibis⁵ attribute to Maraba, the Nestorian Patriarch of Seleucia, at the first half of the sixth century, a translation of the whole Bible from Greek into Syriac; but historical science cannot accept such a tradition without great reserve, and no serious man can sanction it without previously showing some real specimens or quotations from it. As a matter of fact, it is hardly conceivable that a translation undertaken by a man like Maraba would have left no trace in the Syro-Nestorian Church. Would it not be possible, *a pari*, to treat with the same discredit the tradition concerning Rabbūla? Arabists and Syrologues know, I think, how to treat information given by traditionalists with their unlimited hyperboles. Moreover, why has no Monophysite author ever referred to the *Pshitta* as Rabbūla’s Version? Why was the humility of Rabbūla so great as to obliterate his name from the Scriptural annals of an ‘Authorised Version’ intended to exhibit a text accepted by all Syriac-speaking communities? The more pious monks of the sixth and the seventh centuries did not consider the example of Rabbūla worthy of their attention, and the Versions of Philoxenus and Thomas of Harkel are commonly known by the respective names of these two writers.

Another argument likely to weaken the statement of the Jacobite writer of the life of Rabbūla is found in a Syro-Oriental tradition preserved by Isohādād of Merw, in which it is said about the Epistle to the Romans :

‘Mar Kūmī translated this Epistle from Greek into Syriac for Mari the presbyter, with the help of Daniel the presbyter, the Indian.’⁶

Though we do not attach more importance to

³ *Ibid.* p. 457.

⁴ *Maris, Amri et Slibæ Commentaria (pars altera)*, edit. Gismondi, p. 41.

⁵ Assenani’s *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III. i. p. 75.

⁶ M. D. Gibson’s ‘The Comment. of Isohādād’ (in *Epist. ad Romanos*), p. 22.

¹ Professor Burkitt’s *Evangelion da-Mepharreshē* (1904) and *S. Ephraim’s Quotations from the Gospel* (1901).

² Bedjan’s *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, iv. p. 410.

this tradition than to that preserved in the life of Rabbūla, three points are at least clear: viz. that (a) the writers of the Syrian Church did not know exactly who was the author of the Pshiṭta of the New Testament; (b) that each community tried to show that it was prepared by men belonging to their own confession; (c) that, if the whole of it were elaborated by Rabbūla or by Kūmī (end of the sixth century), the Syrian historians ought to have known the fact, and have treated the Version accordingly.

On the other hand, that Rabbūla might be the author of a Syriac Version accepted as authentic by all the Syrian Churches is contradicted by the following fact. We know how deep were the animosity and hatred of the two Aramæan communities, the Nestorian and the Jacobite, to each other. Even in our day, the diversion of some members of both Churches to the Roman communion can by no means affect that animosity, and the members of one community are still sending their brothers belonging to the other community straight to hell. In the case of Rabbūla this animosity is to be accentuated in a far more emphatic manner. His open championship of the cause of Cyril of Alexandria, after some tergiversations towards Nestorius, had sharpened against him the teeth of all the Dyophysites. His existence at Edessa was very precarious. This hostile attitude is made manifest by the famous letter that Ibās, his successor in the episcopate, wrote, some three years after his death, to Mari the Persian bishop of Beith Ardashir. In this letter, Rabbūla is called simply 'the tyrant of the city (of Edessa)'; 'the persecutor not only of the living, but also of the dead.'¹ These invectives are repeated more or less intensely by all Nestorian writers of a later date. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Nestorians would have accepted, in their Christological discussions, a Version translated or elaborated by so suspicious a man, their most deadly enemy? An affirmative answer to this question is very improbable.²

The second argument suggested for the right attribution of the Pshiṭta Version to Rabbūla is not irrefragable either. We are given to understand that the quotations from the Gospels made

by the ancient Syrian Fathers do not agree with the Pshiṭta, but with what it has been a custom to call the *Old Syriac Versions*. The Syrian Fathers who are chiefly quoted for the confirmation of this hypothesis are Ephrem and Aphrahat. Three remarks will not be out of place in this connexion:

1. According to a very probable hypothesis, confirmed by the testimony of almost all the Syrian authors, Ephrem commented upon the Diatessaron; his text, therefore, must have been that of the Diatessaron. We may consequently assume for certain that so long as Tatian's Harmony is not found in its original text, our scientific edifice, on this subject, will be built on pure hypothesis deprived of the natural likelihood of safe criticism. What weight can we attribute, for instance, to two hypotheses to which we may reasonably add five others? As to the case of Aphrahat, our ignorance is even more accentuated, because we cannot tell with certitude what exactly was the version that he used. Was it the Curetonian? Was it the Lewisian? Was it an older form of the Pshiṭta? Was it the Diatessaron? Moreover, the case of this Father writing in the valley of the Tigris, in the old land of Adiabene, cannot be considered as a good instance for the nature of the Syriac Version used in Roman Mesopotamia and in Syria. In fact, some quotations made by this Father agree with one of the four Syriac Versions and disagree with the other, and some quotations disagree with all of them.

2. Our ignorance about the exact text used by the Aramæan writers may be extended even to many Fathers who wrote after the time of Rabbūla. A special mention must be made here of the famous Sahdona³ and of John of Phének.⁴ From the quotations of these two Fathers, to mention only two, it is almost certain that the Syrian writers even of the seventh century and onwards were either using a text lost to-day or quoting from memory and giving more the sense than the precise wording of the Version that they were reading.

3. As I have myself happily found, in a MS. of the seventh to the eighth century, the works of a celebrated Syrian writer, Gregory of Cyprus, whose books were considered as irreparably lost to science, a study by Dr. Rendel Harris will soon be pub-

¹ Cf. P. Martin, *Actes du brigandage d'Éphèse*, pp. 54, 60, 71.

² Cf. Dr. R. Harris' article in the *Expositor*, 1913, pp. 456-465.

³ P. Bedjan's *S. Martyrū qui est Sahdona quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig, 1902.

⁴ A. Mingana's *Sources Syriaques*, vol. i. pars. 11, Leipzig, 1908.

lished about the Biblical importance of this discovery, and will demonstrate that the author who was writing about A.D. 360 was quoting a text nearer to the Pshiṭta than to any other Syriac Version even if it does not altogether agree with it.

From what we have stated above we may conclude that the greatest uncertainty is to be admitted about Rabbūla and the origins of the Syriac Pshiṭta. We cannot, unhappily, substitute irrefragable data for the surmises that we found ourselves bound to weaken. Two things seem to be probable.

(a) The appearance of the Pshiṭta Version is to be assigned to a time preceding at least by some forty years the epoch of the great Christological movement which gave birth to *Dyophysitism* and *Monophysitism*. A Biblical text must have been prepared some years before these heresies, in order that it might have the good fortune to be considered as authoritative by Nestorians and Jacobites alike. The constant use by both Syrian Churches of the same Version without any accusation directed by a member of one community against a partisan of the tenets of the opposite community in the matter of the interpolation of the sacred text is of great weight on this subject, and strictly obliges us to attribute the paternity of the Pshiṭta to a man held in esteem by both Churches in the same manner.

(b) The style used in this Version does not point to a very high antiquity of composition, and does not reflect that simplicity of diction which characterizes sometimes the archaism of a first attempt in any work done by new proselytes. As it stands, we are unable to make it go back to a period prior to the end of the third century. On the other hand, by its quality of being probably a revision of the old Syriac text undertaken with the purpose of rendering it more in harmony with the Greek original as current in Syria and in Palestine at the beginning of the fourth century, it is very possible to suppose that it has been produced at the time when the persecution of Sapor II. strengthened the union of Eastern Christians with their brothers of the Roman Empire.

We know that streams of refugees flowed from all parts of the kingdom of the Sassanides into Roman territory, and by a natural course of events the Christians wished to have the same Biblical text as that of their benefactors and co-religionists. Some years later, on the entrance in the learned Chris-

tian circles of Greek philosophy, the necessity for theological discussions of a Version corresponding almost exactly to the Greek text, made the first Syriac Versions unsuitable for daily use, and the Pshiṭta Version became generally the Vulgate of all Syriac-speaking Churches from that period down to our own day. We do not deny the hypothetic character of the last few lines, but compared with what has been stated above and with the general course of events this hypothesis seems, in the present state of our knowledge, the most plausible.

By the diversity of the style used in the different chapters of the same Gospel, and by some linguistic features found in one Gospel and missing in another, it is possible to admit that the revision of the old Syriac Versions into the Pshiṭta form of our day has not been prepared by the same man nor elaborated at the same period. We deem that a critical study of this Version cannot be safely undertaken at present, until a final and scientific edition of it is given to Syrologues. Our study on the Lewisian and on the Curetonian is confined to one manuscript, and a scholar in perusing the excellent editions prepared by their respective discoverers is sure not to commit grave errors in his dealings with them. To enter, therefore, into comparative and more accentuated linguistic details would be premature and generally useful only to specialists; but the above statements will suffice to give the impression that so far the scientific investigations of the current theme are by no means exhausted.

ALPHONSE MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

'Inspired' Supplication (James v. 16).

I AM much interested in your exposition of this great verse, and write to add a little information which is exclusive to the few who have inherited a copy of that precious volume, the Revisers' (unpublished) First Draft. Its peculiar value is that it tells us when a clear majority of the Revisers favoured a changed reading or rendering; for in the final revision (alas!) eight conservatives could outvote fifteen reformers. In this case the interest is of a different kind. There are two marginal

readings against ‘earnest,’ which appears in the text; the second anticipates the interpretation you quote from my friend, Dr. Rendel Harris: it is, ‘Or, *working mightily*, or, *inwrought* from above.’ I remember my father, Dr. W. F. Moulton, insisting on that last translation well over thirty years ago, when I read the Epistle first as one of his boys at The Leys; and I think he must have been kept away from the Jerusalem Chamber when that chapter was finally revised, and both text and margin damaged. I chronicled this in 1906 (*Prolegomena*, p. 156), and noted that by that time the passive rendering of ἐνεργουμένη was coming to its own, thanks especially to Dr. J. B. Mayor, and to Dean Armitage Robinson’s note in his classical commentary on *Ephesians*. Now you tell us ‘scholars are unanimous,’ and I am very glad, though I should demur to the suggestion that the majority showed ‘insufficient scholarship’ when they preferred the middle to the passive. I should hardly like to assert dogmatically that ἐνεργεῖσθαι is never middle.

But if ἐνεργουμένη is passive, we have to ask ὅπο τίνος; I have always answered ‘By the Holy Spirit,’ and in a little commentary on the Epistle (not yet published) I translate ‘inspired.’ And my reasons are, firstly, that the verb is almost a technical word in the N.T. to describe Divine energy; and secondly, that the example of Elijah, James’s own proof, seems to require it. Where is it said in the Book of Kings that Elijah prayed either for drought or for rain? Elijah’s very first appearance is with the words: ‘As Yahweh the God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word.’ Elijah lives in the King’s Presence-chamber; and ‘surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.’ When the drought is about to end, ‘the word of Yahweh came to Elijah, in the third year, saying, Go, show thyself unto Ahab; and I will send rain upon the earth.’ Again prayer is listening, not speech—receiving, not asking. I am greatly relieved in my own mind to think that Elijah did not entreat God for this awful judgment on his people, from a mere personal conviction that they needed it. But if God whispered His intention into the prophet’s ear, I can well understand his making this supplication. Men may say it becomes superfluous, if God has already declared what He means to do. Yes, but

how do we know what are the determining conditions of drought, or rain, or any phenomena in the outward world? Does the physicist claim that he knows all the forces that maintain or disturb the delicate balance? May not spiritual forces count for a great deal more than we know? ‘More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.’

In urging the importance of recognizing ‘*inspired supplication*’ in this *locus classicus* on Prayer, I am not rejecting the very interesting deductions you yourself draw. But ‘the energy that the man himself throws into it’ may be admitted in the same breath as the assertion that the energy is Divine. Paul is at one here with James—as usual! Paul contradicts himself flagrantly within one sentence when he bids the Philippians work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, ‘FOR it is God which worketh in you [ἐνεργῶν] both to will and to work, for his good pleasure’! The work is all ours, and it is all God’s. Strange that Paul, a quite unusually intelligent man, never saw the faulty logic of which any dabbler in philosophy can so easily convict him! And again Paul tells the Romans that ‘the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered’—our groanings, therefore. We cannot expect to understand in this world the full meaning of Divine Immanence. But just as parallel straight lines meet at infinity, so do many contradictory truths meet in God.

Perhaps the main reason why I have been wrestling with this great text and context for years past is that James draws such an amazing inference as to the problem of pain. The ‘Christian’ ‘Scientist’ has interpreted James quite literally, and produced a *reductio ad absurdum*. The senior members of the congregation are to gather round the sick man, and when they have used a simple remedy they are to pray over him. ‘And the prayer of faith shall save [physically] him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.’ So if there were only enough ‘elders’ in the world who could pray a ‘prayer of faith,’ there would be ‘no more death, neither mourning, nor crying, nor pain.’ Then what about that prayer which did not remove Paul’s ‘thorn in the flesh’? Nay, what about that other prayer which only brought the agony of Calvary upon that of the Garden?

I think that ἐνεργουμένη holds the key to the problem. Elijah was not the last man admitted to the Presence, to hear things that cannot be uttered.

There are two mothers whose sons are starting for the front to-day, close friends, and both alike devout and loving and full of faith. Both have been praying fervently that their boys may return safely. In the prayer of one there is a serene certainty. She will pray on, till the Evil Thing is over; and all the time she *knows* she will see him again safe and sound. In the other prayer there is from the first the note of resignation. The mother has given her son to her country's need, and she knows that very many will not only offer but lay down life for what is dearer than life—why should her boy be spared when another mother is heart-broken? So in her unceasing prayer there is the burden, 'Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done!' What shall we say when the first woman's son comes home unhurt, only to tell how his friend charged him with dying messages of love to his mother? Was there less faith in one prayer than the other? Was the first prayer superfluous and the other unheard on high? Nay, was not the one an unseen agency in God's hand which did its part in keeping that soldier safe from harm? A thousand fell at his side, but it came not near him, for Prayer kept shot and shell away. And as to the other prayer, was it not answered from the first with 'power made perfect in weakness'? We ask wistfully why one was taken and the other left. Ah, but we do not know what ordained tasks were waiting, one here, another There. The prayer that seemingly was not answered will bring the stricken mother grace for her need, and if not vision, most certainly faith, that somewhere her boy is already beginning a more important duty than she dreamed for him to do on earth. Such, I take it, is 'inspired supplication.' How does it work in that faithful community that James portrays? One member is sick,

and there come to him at his call other members, ripe in experience of the things of God. They use an ordinary remedy, praying for blessing on its use; and they pray for him, when he has told them what is on his mind, as they are ready to tell him what is on theirs. In gracious fellowship they seek the Lord together, and a conviction steals into their minds that God still has need of His servant to serve Him here. Who sent it? He who can use both the oil and the prayer to cure the body He made, and accounts the prayer more potent than the oil, or even than our whole modern pharmacopoeia.¹

James does not here contemplate the case where these good men will pray, and pray believably, but physical 'saving' will *not* follow. But was it not he who told us that our words should always be, 'If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do this or that'? We may be sure he never dreamed that those 'elders' would always have the inspired conviction that their brother would recover. One recalls that picture, familiar to every Methodist, of the dying Wesley in the little room in City Road, with his preachers around him. Some are weeping; all, we may be sure, are praying. Were they wanting in faith if they hardly thought of asking that God would add to those wonderfully fruitful eighty-eight years? Did not faith rather bring to them the message that God would take away their master from their head that day? The prayer of faith pleaded for grace to do God's work without him. And the experience of a century and a quarter tells us that it was answered.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

¹ May I note here that I am trying to interpret an amazing personal experience of Mr. C. T. Studd's in the heart of Africa, as told us by himself at the W.M.M.S. meeting in Manchester this March?

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The best series of illustrations from the War have been sent by the Rev. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven. Other ten who sent excellent collections have been communicated with privately. The number of fine illustrations available has been a surprise. It is a surprise also that so many of them directly illustrate texts of Scripture.

The Editor is willing to make the same offer again—that is to say, a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue—for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six

volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

An Anthology.

An attractive little anthology of prose and verse has been added to Messrs. Allen & Unwin's 'Sesame Library' under the title of *Life's Pilgrimage* (1s. net). The selections have been made by Edwin H. Eland. Here is a quotation from Mary Cholmondeley :

THE ETERNAL THINGS.

Hope, and Love, and Enthusiasm never die.
We think in youth that we bury them in the graveyards of our hearts, but the grass never yet grew over them. How then can life be sad, when they walk beside us always in the growing light towards the Perfect Day?

Conrad Aiken.

Mr. Conrad Aiken's poetry recalls the poetry of John Masefield, and he knows it. But he claims that before he ever heard of Masefield he was experimenting with narrative poems of modern daily life. The volume which he has published contains eleven poems, all narrative, all of modern daily life, and all reminiscent somewhat of Masefield. But there is no slavish imitation. Mr. Aiken is a true poet. The poems are too long for quotation. Here are a few lines out of one. The title of the book is *Earth Triumphant* (Macmillan ; 5s. 6d. net).

Up from the valley's dark, two miles below,
The light wind brought a fading sound of bells,
The church clock struck the hour, sweet and
slow,
Some notes they missed, some came with the
wind's swells ;
The wind came soft, sweet with the soft night
smells,
Meadows and pines, and dew on new-mown grass ;
So time passes, so even earth must pass.

The hymns *O Love that wilt not let me go* and *I think when I read that sweet story of old* have been separately printed and published, adorned happily with pictures and decorations (Abingdon Press ; 25 cents net).

R. A. Cumine.

The Rev. R. A. Cumine has put his conception of the gospel into poetry. It is a portrait of *The Messiah* (Century Press ; 3s. 6d. net), but it is the Messiah as interpreted by a theologian and with an unmistakable design. The design is to preach the gospel. And does not George Herbert tell us—

A verse may find him who a sermon flies,
And turn delight into a sacrifice ?

Let us quote a few lines from Mr. Cumine's poem :

And Jesus lifting up His eyes to heaven
Gave thanks unto the Father, that the Jews
Might hear Him and believe ; and standing there
Cried with a sudden loud and startling cry :
Lazarus, come forth ! And sleeping Lazarus
heard,
And straightway from the height or from the
deep
Returned obedient ; and that awful shape
Crept out into the sunshine from the tomb.
Some shrieked and hid their faces ; many stood
Like men that have been frozen into stone
Not knowing yet if this were life indeed,
Or some terrific jugglery with death.
None moved to touch him until Jesus said :
Loose him, and let him go ! Then all at once
Brake forth the mighty tumult of their joy.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. J. B. Maclean, Huntingdon, Quebec.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 20th of March. The text is Ph 2⁹⁻¹¹.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.